AN

Address to the Quakers:

INCLUDING THE PAMPHLET

ENTITLED,

ERRORS OF THE QUAKERS, &c.

WITH A PREFACE,

In which the Author states his reasons for writing the Errors of the Quakers; and with a Postscript, containing further reasons for that publication.

BY THE REV. BILLY HIBBARD.

When I therefore was thus minded, did I use lightness? or the things that I purpose, do I purpose according to the flesh, that with me there should be yea, yea, and nay, nay? But as God is true, our word towards you was not yea and nay. 2 Cor i 17, 18.

NEW-YORK:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR,

1811.

HARVARD
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
NOV 13 1944

Jackson Fund

****

COPY-RIGHT SECURED ACCORDING TO LAW.

****

45-26
2735
10

PREFACE.

IT is common and natural for readers to inquire into the cause or reason of an author for his writing, especially if his book is controversial. And no wonder that the pamphlet entitled "Errors of the Quakers," should seem odd to many readers, seeing it was without name, preface, or apology. However, that small neglect is no cause why honest men should not receive plain truth: as the pamphlet does not contain any thing else but plain truth concerning the Quakers. Yet an edition of the work, with an improvement, makes it necessary for the author to preface the whole, and state his reasons for writing.

When I was ordained Elder in the church of God, one important question of the many that were asked me, was, "Will you be "ready with all faithful diligence to banish "and drive away all erroneous and strange "doctrines, contrary to God's word; and to use "both public and private monitions and exorta-"tions, as well to the sick as the whole, with-

"in your district, as need shall require, and "occasion shall be given?" To which I answered, "I will, the Lord being my helper."

The great responsibility I have ever viewed myself under to God, requires that I speak and act here below not according to my own will, but according to the will of God, who hath called me to minister in holy things; *And knowing the terrors of the Lord*, I desire to warn and persuade men.

Since I have been travelling in connexion with the Methodists, it has generally been my lot to have special charge of the circuit I have travelled on. This charge embraces all those duties of a minister employed in governing the church. And when I have had complaints against members of society for violating the sabbath, for neglecting the ordinances of Christ, family prayer, &c. many of those members, for an excuse of such evils, have plead the principles of Quakers to justify themselves. This led me to reprove the principle, as it was evidently productive of bad fruit, and had obliged me to expel some members from society for immoral conduct.

Principles that inspire men with contempt of the moral law of God, and ordinances of the

adorable Jesus, have offended me much and filled my heart with grief; for which reason I wrote a plain and true statement of the Errors of the Quakers. I wrote with prayer and tears, in humble hope that it would be rendered a blessing to the Methodists, Presbyterians, Churchmen, Baptists, &c. and those of no persuasion, as well as Quakers.

I did not engage in this work because of any personal injury they have done me, any farther than their immoral conduct in violating the sabbath, and contempt of the ordinances of Christ was a continual grief to me. However, the injury that hundreds received by the principles and manners peculiar to the Quakers, was highly alarming; for many, to my certain knowledge, were corrupted in principles and morals. Each professing a disregard of a part of the moral law, and all agreeing in a total neglect and open contempt of the ordinances of Christ. This consideration called loud for a warning from some one; and as I saw the Quakers stood equally opposed to one denomination as to another, I viewed it was as much the duty of a Churchman, Presbyterian, or Baptist, as for a Methodist, to write a statement of their errors.

Those denominations above named agree in their belief of the scripture as a sufficient rule for faith and practice. They also believe in the ordinances of Christ, though they differ in the mode of administering those ordinances. Yet, why those ministers and professors should feel such consciousness respecting the mode of administration, as to preach, write, print books of debate against each other, when they only differ in the mode and not in the ordinance, and no one for many years should feel his tender conscience affected so as to write a reproof to the Quakers for neglecting them altogether, is what I cannot explain or account for, otherwise than as our Lord says of some, *they strain out a gnat and swallow a camel.* Reader think of this!

The ostensible reason for writing the pamphlet entitled "Errors of the Quakers," was, a firm belief that their principles and forms were hostile to the scriptures, and general received opinions of all denominations of Christians. The statement of facts in the pamphlet shews my faith in them to be well founded. I consider myself therefore on the defensive, and set for the defence of the gospel of Christ.

from the mystical rant, or ambiguous cant of Quakerism.

I love good men of all persuasions, and plain dealing on every subject. But this professing charity, when we will not join in the worship of God with those who differ from us in non-essentials only, is too much hypocrisy for me. But my charity, however, does not obligate me to justify the mistaken notions, or the impiety of those zealots, who, while they manifest their knowledge of the forms peculiar to their own order, are, nevertheless, manifestly ignorant of experimental religion.

Forms and fair shows deceive us; especially when we judge of men by their profession only: But when we judge according to gospel rule, viz. *by their fruits ye shall know them*, we go on safe ground.

It has been, and still is my opinion, that the Quakers differ from other denominations in something more than non-essentials; for the principle denominations that I am acquainted with in this country, agree in believing that the scripture is the word of God, and of course a sufficient rule for faith and practice. They also agree to believe that we are under an obligation to observe the moral law, and the

ordinances of Christ. But Quakers deny all this. Therefore they differ from other denominations in very essential particulars. But this difference they have effected, or strove to hide from public notice by various ambiguous phrases, by which they seem to hold as others do in those points, but in reality do not. And when closely inquired of concerning their real meaning, to prevent a discovery of their error, they throw the subject into mystery. So as was said in the pamphlet, "Mystery swallows up all their difficulties, they slide along at ease." The late attempts of the Quakers to evade the force of the charges in the pamphlet, clearly prove me correct in my opinion of them in this matter.

The reader will expect that I should give some reason why I did not put my name to the work—suffice it to say, that I thought it best not to put my name to the work, for I did not want men to judge of me, but of the work. Besides, I knew that the Quakers were a sly people. As Mr. Pope says,

> Is he a Churchman: he is fond of power:
> A Quaker—sly: a Presbyterian—sour:
> A smart Freethinker—all things in an hour.

And because they were a sly people, I believ-

ed it would have a better effect on them, to reprove with some degree of slyness, so that they might amend in morality, if not in principle, with better advantage to themselves. And I think my expectation is verified at least in part; for many of them have not been so barefaced in violating the Sabbath since I wrote as they were before. And, if I am informed right, they have not had so many dumb meetings as they used to have. But whether this is an advantage to them or not, I cannot tell.*

---

* The Quakers vociferate much against the practice of ministers of other persuasions for speaking on all occasions, and to justify their complaint they assign two reasons.

1st. Because men ought not to preach or exhort without the influence of the good spirit.

2d. Because men ought not to speak, unless they preach good doctrine.

Now if this is the reason why the Quakers have silent meetings, viz. because they have not the influence of the spirit, I cannot tell but it would be best for them to have all silent meetings; inasmuch as we cannot judge their spirit to be good or bad, but as we see the fruit: and as their spirit hath hitherto led them to preach often against the ordinances of Christ, and to deny the moral obligation to observe the sab-

However, it is a good thing to observe and keep the Sabbath.

But, with respect to principle, their late attempts to evade the force of the charges in the pamphlet, clearly evince, that they will run great lengths in presumption, to support their principles. Their manner of attack justifies me in adopting the language of Jeremiah as my own: chap. xx. ver. 7, &c. *I am in derision daily, every one mocketh me. For since I spake I cried out. I cried violence and spoil: because the Word of the Lord was made a reproach unto me, and a derision daily. Then I said, I will not make mention of him, nor speak any more in his name: But his word was in mine heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I was weary with forbearing, and I could not stay. For I heard the defaming of many, fear on every side. Report; say they, and we will report it. All my familiars watched for my halting, saying, peradventure he will be enticed, and we shall prevail against him,*

---

bath, we must conclude that it is a bad spirit that often influences them to this; therefore I cannot tell that their much preaching is any advantage to them or not.

and we shall take our revenge on him. But the Lord is with me as a mighty terrible one, therefore my perecutors shall stumble and they shall not prevail. They shall be greatly ashamed for they shall not prosper: their everlasting confusion shall never be forgotten.

But, notwithstanding that the principles and manners of the Quakers are, in my opinion, so very contrary to scripture and reason, even to cause many to stumble and fall, yet there are some professed Quakers who manifest so much morality and sincerity in their lives and conversation, as to merit from us an acknowledgment that they are good men. But then, we must consider that, by living among Christians of other denominations, from whom they receive reproof and council, are greatly benefited, and assisted to form many right opinions. And though they are mistaken in some essential points of doctrine, yet the mistake seems to arise from a good intention. Such men are not hurt or wounded by my reproofs in the pamphlet. Though they are grieved and distressed, it is because they had entertained an idea that their principles accorded with the scriptures, and the essential principles of other denominations. But they were mistaken--

And on reading the pamphlet they see the mistake, and strive to reconcile it to scripture and reason, but cannot. They have thought that the Quakers believed the scriptures to be the WORD OF GOD, and that they regarded them as a rule for faith and practice. But since the reading of the pamphlet, they find they were mistaken. This has wounded them; that is, not the reproofs, but the errors they find their brethren guilty of. And when their preachers deny the scriptures to be the Word of God, and still pretend to have a high regard for them, the sensible and sincere part of their community are wounded; not because of my charges in the pamphlet, but because their speakers evince the truth of these charges, and thereby publish their error in the face of the world.

I hope, from these considerations, the reader will see the necessity of a reproof to the Quakers. And if in your opinion I am not severe enough with them, pray for me. And if too severe, pray for me. My great intention has been to be plain and honest in my writing, weighing every part of the subject with prayer to God; having my mind deeply impress with

the doctrine exprest in Proverbs xxiv. 24: *He that saith unto the wicked, Thou art righteous; him shall the people curse, nations shall abhor him: But to them that rebuke him shall he delight, and a good blessing shall come upon them.* Also, chap. xxvii. 6: *Faithful are the wounds of a friend, but the kisses of an enemy are deceitful.* If my writings meet your approbation, well—if not, it is as well: for I have not sought glory of men, neither have I engaged to please or displease any man, or set of men.* The Lord called me to write the Errors of the Quakers—and the Lord has already blest my little labour to the good of hundreds; and I am confident he will still bless it.

I desire the reader to divest himself of prejudice, if he has any, and read this book with desire to know the truth of the real principles of the Quakers. And if you notice what I quoted from their authors, you will agree

---

* St. Clement says in his epistle, section 21st. "It is therefore just, that we should not forsake our rank by doing contrary to his will: let us choose to offend a few foolish and inconsiderate men, lifted up and glorying in their own pride, rather than God."

with me, that the quotations clearly prove the charges in the book. May the Lord inspire you and me, with such love for the Quakers, and all men, as to suitably engage us to reprove them for their errors and wickedness, and encourage them in virtue's ways, so we with them may live to God, and not to man.

I am

B. H.

SOME

ERRORS

OF THE

QUAKERS,

LAID OPEN WITH PLAINNESS,

BY A PLAIN MAN,

AND A LOVER OF HONESTY.

PRINTED FOR THE READER,

price 6d.

December, 1808.

ERRORS OF THE QUAKERS.

1st. The Quakers deny that the Scripture is the WORD of GOD.

Barcley's Apol. page 68 *to* 94.
Fox's Journal, vol. 1. *p.* 32.

WHAT they mean by this denial is difficult to tell; because of the ambiguity of their expressions. Some say it is the WORDS of God, or the declarative Word of God; as though the *word* of God was of greater consequence than the words of God, and the declarative word of God had not the same authority as the word of God. We know not the cause or use of this criticism and nice distinction of the Word from the Word, unless it is to fix the name of the word upon *Christ*, as it is written, John i. 1. But this is not a sufficient excuse for a needless play of words; though they say that "*The* "*Scripture ought not to be called the Word of*

"*God, because Christ is called the Word.*" By this mode of reasoning we might say that the *door* of an house ought not to be called the door, because Christ is the door: and a *vine* ought not to be called by just that name, because Christ says, *I am the vine.* Why the Quakers deny the scriptures to be the Word of God, is evidently in order to invalidate the divine authority which they have as a rule for faith and practice. Though they say, they have an high opinion of the *Holy Scripture*, yet it is evident they have an higher opinion of the writings of *Fox*, *Barcley*, and other Quaker writers. It is known that the Quakers understand the different degrees of goodness, as good, better, best. The scripture is *good*, the writings of Quakers *better*, the teaching of the Spirit *best.* This sets the Quakers high, as many of them say they are one degree higher than any other dispensation that has ever yet appeared. But for them to deny the scriptures to be the word of God, puts *Moses and the Prophets* in such a point of light as to oblige the reader to doubt the truth of what they say. For their language is, *Thus saith*

the Lord—Hear ye the word of the Lord God. Then they relate what they call the word of the Lord God, which declarations the apostles call the scripture. *All* scripture is given by inspiration of God. Holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, and being moved by the Holy Ghost they called what they said, *The Word of God.* How then dare the Quakers to contradict and say it is not? What confidence shall we put in men that are wise above what is written?

When Quakers reject the scriptures as an all-sufficient rule for *faith and practice*, what will they substitute in its place to try the Spirit by, as it is written, "*Believe not every Spirit, but try the Spirits?*" For this we must have an unerring rule; one that is given us by an unerring God. The scripture is such a rule. But the Quakers have rejected this as a proper rule. What then will they try the Spirit by? The best answer they give us is, "*We try the Spirit by the Spirit.*" But how will they know a good spirit from a bad spirit, seeing a good spirit will not justify a bad spirit, nor a bad spirit a good one? For this

we must take their bare word. If they say it is the true spirit, so it must go, (if you would not persecute,) for its an offence to contradict them: while the plain truth is, they have a spirit; but whether good or bad "to the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. viii. 20.

O may the Lord deliver the reader of these lines from falling into self conceit, that puffs the mind with vain confidence.

2d. Quakers do not believe that the new birth is an instantaneous work of the Holy Spirit. *Barcley Apol. page* 368. Thereby confounding conversion with conviction.

3d. Quakers deny an obligation to obey the fourth commandment, by observing the first day of the week as the Sabbath of the Lord. *Barcley's Apol. page* 349. His words are:

"Although it be not my present purpose to make a long digression concerning the debates among *Protestants* about the first day of the week, commonly called the Lord's day,

yet, forasmuch as it comes fitly in here, I shall briefly signify our sense thereof.

"We, not seeing any ground in scripture for it, cannot be so superstitious as to believe that either the *Jewish Sabbath* now continues, or that the *first day* of the *week* is the *antitype* thereof, or the true Christian Sabbath; which, with *Calvin*, we believe to have a more spiritual sense: and therefore we know no moral obligation by the fourth commandment, or elsewhere, to keep the first day of the week more than any other, or any holiness inherent in it."

"We know no moral obligation by the fourth commandment or elsewhere." This is a profession of great ignorance. And because ignorant, Quakers plead innocence.—But the sin of ignorance is not so winked at as it was before God commanded *all men every where* to repent. They might have known if they had not rejected the counsel of God; but having cast off the word of God as spoken by Moses and the Prophets, and followed their conceited, whimsical imagination, they change the glory of the ordinances of God

and of Christ, into mystical whimsy, professing to have them in spirit, while they deride the outward observance of them.

The fourth commandment is one of the ten that God gave from Mount Sinai. The ten were wrote on two tables of stone: the four first on the first table, the six last on the second table. The first table teaches our duty to God, the second our duty to each other. The same God that said, *Thou shalt not kill*, said also, *Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it Holy*. If one is binding on us, so also is the other; and that which teaches us the greatest duty is the most binding. The fourth commandment teaches our duty to God, therefore the fourth commandment is most binding. The ten commandments are all binding on us; and neither Christ nor his apostles have ever disannulled one of them, but only explained them. Therefore, if any man transgress the fourth commandment, he is guilty in the sight of God even as a murderer or a thief is guilty, because he transgresses one of the greatest commandments, and in fact he transgresses all the other six.

He dishonours his parents, (which is a breach of the fifth commandment) who taught him the fear of the Lord, by not fearing to disobey him. He is a murderer of his own soul, and as far as the influence of his example extends, of those of others. He is an adulterer, because he held an unlawful alliance with mammon.* He is a thief in taking that time that is not his own, without leave. He has borne false witness, by saying he had a right to work on the sabbath, when he had not. He is guilty of a breach of the tenth command, by coveting that which is not his own, and that which he could not pay for.

"We know no moral obligation by the fourth commandment, OR ELSEWHERE."

Had Mr. Barcley read and understood the words of Christ, Matt. xii. 8. *For the Son of man is Lord even of the sabbath day*, he would not have been so ignorant. For this declaration of Christ implies that he was the author and institutor of the day, as it is written, *All*

* As it is written, James iv. 4. Ye adulterers and adultresses, know ye not that the friendship of this world is enmity with God.

things were made by him, and without *him was not any thing made that was made.* Then to him we owe the observance of it. So the apostles understood it, and ever after called it the Lord's day; which name implies that the day should be kept holy unto the Lord.

The fourth commandment is both moral and ceremonial. It is a moral obligation on us, because the Lord commanded, *Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy.* It is ceremonial, because we are to observe it in remembrance *that in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and rested* (or ceased from his work) *on the seventh day.* (Note.) The seventh day was to be observed in remembrance of God's great goodness in the work of Creation. Whoever then believes that Jesus Christ is God over all, and that the work of redemption wrought out by his death and resurrection was a greater display of the goodness of God to man than the work of creation, will feel no scruples of conscience in observing the first day of the week as the sabbath of the Lord God, seeing it is no change of the sabbath, but only of the day to be a sabbath

for us unto the Lord; and that because the Lord of the sabbath ended his great work for the redemption of man, by rising from the dead on that day.*

---

* St. Barnabas says in his Catholic epistle, section 15th. "Furthermore it is written concerning the sabbath. In the ten commandments which God spake in the Mount Sinai to Moses, face to face: "Sanctify the sabbath of the Lord with pure hands, and with a clean heart," (Exod. xx. 2.) And elsewhere he saith, "If thy children keep my sabbaths, then will I put my mercy upon them." (Jer. xvii. 24.) and even in the beginning of the creation he makes mention of the sabbath, "And God made in six days the work of his hands, and he finished them on the seventh day; and he rested the seventh day, and sanctified it." (Gen. ii. 2.) Consider, my children, what that signifies, *he finished them in six days.* The meaning of it is this; that in six thousand years the Lord God will bring all things to an end; for with him one day is a thousand years, as himself testifieth, saying, "Behold this day shall be as a thousand years:" therefore, children, in six days, that is in six thousand years shall all things be accomplished. And what is that he saith, "*And he rested the seventh day;*" he meaneth this, that when his Son shall come, and abolish the season of the wicked one, and judge the ungodly; and shall change the sun, and the moon, and the stars, then he shall gloriously rest

4th. The Quakers deny the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. Barcley has not made it a subject of discourse in all his Apol-

---

in that seventh day. He adds lastly, "Thou shalt sanctify it with clean hands and a pure heart:" Wherefore we are greatly deceived if we imagine that any one can now sanctify that day which God has made holy, without having a heart pure in all things. Behold, therefore, he will then truly sanctify it with blessed rest, when we (having received the righteous promise, when iniquity shall be no more, all things being renewed by the Lord,) shall be able to sanctify it, being ourselves first made holy. Lastly, he saith unto them, "Your new moons and your sabbaths, I cannot bear them." (Isa. i. 13.) Consider what he means by it: The sabbaths, says he, which ye now keep are not acceptable unto me, but those which I have made, when resting from all things, I shall begin the eighth day, that is, the beginning of the other world. For which cause we observe the eighth day with gladness, in which Jesus rose from the dead, and having manifested himself to his disciples, ascended into heaven."

This is sufficient to convince all candid men, that though the institution of the sabbath does tipify a glorious rest yet to come, it is also evident that there was a moral obligation to observe the seventh day of the week, and now the same obligation to observe the first, or (as St. Barnabas says) the eighth; and for good reasons,—all glory be to God."

logy to give any decided opinion. Holmes would have his readers believe that the Quakers hold the doctrine of a Resurrection. But instead of explaining he has exploded the subject by cautioning the reader not to be inquisitive about it, lest the appellation, *thou fool*, be applied to him.

When you ask a Quaker if he believes in the resurrection of the body? He will say; Yes, I believe in a resurrection. You are ready to receive his answer as plain and full; but when he explains his doctrine he pretends to be so spiritual and wise, that instead of the resurrection of the body, he only holds a raising of the soul from a state of death in sin. Is it not strange that Quakers do not know that they quibble and use duplicity by answering a plain question in such an evasive manner? The resurrection of the body, and redemption of the soul, are two things. Some Quakers, however, have said plainly, that they did not believe in the resurrection of the body, and added, they did not think it an essential doctrine. But when they were told, that *if*

the dead rise not, then is not Christ risen, and if Christ be not risen then is our preaching vain, and your faith is vain. Ye are yet in your sins.* They will say, Ah! I believe in a resurrection. And by such ambiguous terms and words they evade a direct answer, for they do not mean that they believe in the resurrection of the body.† Therefore they

---

* Some Quakers say, That the resurrection of Christ was a spiritual resurrection, *i. e.* his spirit rose, but not his body. Also, they say, That the resurrection means a raising souls that are *dead in trespasses and in sins.* If this is all that is meant by the doctrine, then it implies, that Christ was once dead in trespasses and sins, or he could not have been the first fruits of them that slept, as the scripture saith of him.

† St. Polycarp's epistle to the Philippians, as given us in the book entitled, The Apostolical Fathers, New-York edition of 1810, page 186, section 7. "For whosoever does not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, he is antichrist; and whoever does not confess his suffering upon the cross, is from the devil; and whosoever perverts the oracles of the Lord to his own lusts, and says that there shall neither be any resurrection, nor judgment, he is the first-born of satan. Wherefore, leaving the vanity of many, and their false doctrines, let us return unto the word that was delivered to us from the beginning; watching unto prayer.

transgress one of their own (and by them considered very essential) rules, viz. to use plain

---

St. Clement speaks of the Doctrine of the Resurrection in his epistle to the Corinthians, section 24, 25, 26—thus: "Let us consider, beloved, how the Lord does continually shew us, that there shall be a future resurrection, of which he has made our Lord Jesus Christ the first fruits, raising him from the dead. Let us contemplate, beloved, the resurrection that is continually made before our eyes: day and night manifests a resurrection to us; the night lies down, and the day arises! again the day departs and the night comes on. Let us behold the fruits of the earth; every one sees how the seed is sown; the sower goes forth and casts it upon the earth, and the seed which when it was sown fell upon the earth dry and naked, in time dissolves, and from the dissolution the great power of the providence of the Lord raises it again; and of one seed many arise and bring forth fruit. For he says in a certain place, "Thou shalt raise me up, and I shall confess unto thee:" and again, "I laid me down and slept, and awaked, because thou art with me," (Psalm iii. 5.) and again Job says, "Thou shalt raise up this flesh of mine, that has suffered all these things," (Job xix. 26.)

Again, in what is called his second epistle, section 9, he says, "And let not any among you say, that this very flesh is not judged, neither raised up: consider,

language ; that is, speak as you mean, and not tell lies to God or man. For *Homer* says,

---

in what were ye saved, in what did ye look up, if not whilst ye were in this flesh ? We must therefore keep our flesh as the temple of God, for in like manner as ye were called in the flesh, ye shall also come to judgment in the flesh. Our one Lord Jesus Christ, who has saved us, being first a spirit, was made flesh, and so called us : even so we also shall in this flesh receive the reward.

Ignatius, in his epistle to the Smyrneans, section 1, 2, 3, 4, speaking of Christ's birth and baptism, he says : " He was also truly crucified by Pontius Pilate and Herod the tetrarch, being nailed for us in the flesh, by the fruits of which we are, even by his most blessed passion ; that he set up a token for all ages through his resurrection, to all his holy and faithful servants, whether they be Jews or Gentiles, in one body of his church.

Now all these things he suffered for us, that we might be saved ; and he suffered truly, as he also truly raised up himself ; and not as some unbelievers say, that he only seemed to suffer, they themselves only seeming to be. But I know that even after his resurrection he was in the FLESH, and I believe he is still SO. And when he came to those who were with Peter, he said unto them, " *Take, handle me, and see that I am not an incorporeal dæmon.*" And straightway they

"He who speaks contrary to what he means,
"ought to be held a common enemy, and
"hated as the gates of hell."

---

felt him and believed, being convinced both by his flesh and spirit; for this cause they despised death, and were found to be above it. But after his resurrection he did eat and drink with them, as he was flesh; although as to his spirit, he was united to the Father.

Now these things, beloved, I put you in mind of, not questioning but that you yourselves also believe that they are so. But I arm you before-hand against certain beasts in the shape of men, whom you must not only not receive, but if it be possible you must not meet with, only you must pray for them, that if it be the will of God, they may repent, which yet will be very hard; but of this our Lord Jesus Christ has the power, who is our true life. For if all these things were done only in shew by our Lord, then do I also seem only to be bound: and why have I given up myself to death, to fire, to the sword, to wild beasts? Only in the name of Jesus Christ I undergo all, to suffer together with him; he who was made a perfect man strengthening me; whom some, not knowing, do deny, or rather have been denied by him, being advocates of death rather than of truth; whom neither the prophecies nor the law of Moses have persuaded, nor the gospel itself even to this day, nor the sufferings of every one of us, for they think also the same things of us. For what does a man profit me, if he shall praise me, and blas-

5th. Quakers deny the ordinances of Christ, viz. the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and

---

pheme my Lord, not confessing that he was truly made man? Now he that doth not say this, does in effect deny him, and is in death. But for the names of such as do this, they being unbelievers, I thought it not fitting to write them unto you. Yea, God forbid that I should make any mention of them, until they shall repent to a true belief of Christ's passion, which is our resurrection. Let no man deceive himself, both the things which are in heaven, and the glorious angels, and princes, whether visible or invisible, if they believe not in the blood of Christ, it shall be to them to condemnation. That which is worth all is faith and charity, to which nothing is to be preferred. But consider those who are of a different opinion from us, as to what concerns the grace of Jesus Christ, which is come unto us, how contrary they are in the design of God? They abstain from the eucharist, *(i.e. sacrament)* and from the public offices, because they confess not the eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ which suffered for our sins, and which the Father of his goodness raised from the dead; and for this cause contradicting the gift of God, they die in their disputes: but much better would it be for them to receive it, that they might one day rise through it. It will therefore become you to abstain from such persons, and not to speak with them neither in private nor in public; but to hearken to the prophets, and es-

Baptism. *Barcley's Apol. page* 424 *and* 485.

When the reader has examined what *Mr. Barcley*, and others of the order are pleased to call argument on the subject: and proving his propositions; they will find them to read thus: *Therefore it is plain—having proved before—It can be proved—It was to cease—It is not commanded—Our adversaries are divided in their opinion—I shall prove—Many did not believe it—It is not Christ's baptism—I have proved before—Our adversaries cannot deny—We know the true light now shineth—It will enlighten all—We shall prove.*

Thus they assert and affirm. And an assertion proves an affirmation, and an affirmation proves an assertion. In this way they can prove any thing, and prove it by the scripture too; for when they have produced a text

---

pecially to the gospel, in which both Christ's passion is manifested unto us, and his resurrection perfectly declared. Let no man do any thing of what belongs to the church, separately from the bishop. Let that eucharist be looked upon as well established, which is either offered by the bishop, or by him to whom the bishop has given his consent.

of scripture, they declare what the meaning is, literal or spiritual as best suits their subject: then they apply it, affirming *this is proof.* Thus they make all things plain to them that believe just as they do. And those that don't see as they do, are blind. It is worthy of notice that the Quakers spiritualize upon spiritual things, and explain away *all* the literal meaning of the subject; and to help themselves out of their difficulties they call it MYSTERY, yet it is plain to them. So *Mysticism* swallows up all their difficulties, they slide along at ease.

6th. The Quakers declare that the apostles (and of course) ministers were authorised to baptize with the Holy Ghost. *Barcley's Apol. page* 432—his words are, "Therefore the baptism commanded by Christ to his apostles was not water baptism. That baptism which Christ commanded his apostles *was the* one baptism, *id est* his own baptism."

This affirmation of Mr. Barcley signifies, that the ministers of Christ are authorised to baptize WITH the Holy Ghost. Not in the NAME of, but WITH the Holy Ghost, *i. e.*

a power to confer the Holy Ghost on whomsoever the Minister chooses as an object worthy of this blessing. Besides it implies a power to control or command him. And to say that any man is indued with power to baptize WITH the Holy Ghost, is a bold presumption, because Christ no where commands it; and it is a *bold* blasphemy, because it is arrogating a power that makes the man or minister equal with Christ. Is it not a pity that Quakers did not see a difference between baptizing in the *name* of, and baptizing with the Holy Ghost. Is it not also a shame that the people that profess to have more light and knowledge than any other dispensation that has ever been, do not give to the Saviour that honour which others do. John the Baptist said—"I indeed baptize you with water, but he (Christ) shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost."

7th. The Quakers teach for doctrine the commandments of men. Having rejected the ordinances of Christ, calling them carnal ordinances, classing them with the rudiments of the world; and those that observe to worship

God in the use of them, they call blind, carnal, out of Christ, not yet in the true light, enemies and adversaries to them.

They take *George Fox* for their oracle.—He was the institutor of those ordinances held sacred among the Quakers; such as, wearing his *hat* in time of meeting, and while eating, his *thee* and *thou* to a single person, his refusing to say good morrow or good by, but *how does thee do, farewell.* His saying *first day, second day, first month, second month.* His *never saying*, yes Sir, or no Sir; but *Yes, No.* His calling men by their given names, as, Peter, John, Richard. His refusing to say *Mr. Mrs.* His plain *dress*, &c. *Fox's jour. 1st. vol, page* 29. where the reader may see from what authority he has those *ordinances.* He says from God, so did *Mahomet*; but who believes either. *I dont*—however *Barcley* does, for he says in his *Apol. page* 529, "Now *kneeling, bowing*, and *uncovering the head* is the *alone* outward signification of our *adoration* towards *God, and therefore it is not lawful to give it unto man.*" By this we are taught, that it is unlawful to take

off the *hat (whether a flat or a high crowned one)* on every occasion. To take off the *hat* in time of meeting is unlawful. To take off the *hat* while eating and drinking (and I don't know but while sleeping) is unlawful. To take off the *hat* when in a neighbour's house, or in any court; as the congress or assembly, or in the presence of any person or beast, even dog or cat is unlawful, unless we are preaching or praying. Pulling off the *hat* is one of the "*alone significations of our adoration*," saith *Barcley*. So then, we must know that when the Quakers have their hats off, they are then paying adoration to God. But if they worship only then, it is not very often, nor very much even in their meetings. Also for this, they have suffered great persecution, as we read in *Barcley's Apol. page* 531. "Many of us having been *sorely beaten* and buffeted; yea, and several months imprisoned, for no other reason but because we could not so satisfy the *proud unreasonable humours of proud men*, as to *uncover our heads*."

Though this was persecution, yet it was not for righteousness sake. However, it is

mentioned by them to prove that the ordinance is sacred.

They would make us believe that George Fox first had these ordinances by special command. When he went forth in that mighty spirit he was possest of, to cry down the steeple houses, priests, and worshippers; regulate courts and judges, and teach doctors of physic how to use the creatures he saw the names and natures of, as you may read in *Fox's jour. vol. 1st. from page 20 to 30*: also the "mighty effect these *ordinances* had, (says he) to mortify proud nature, and to arouse the slumbering world.* It soon discovered who was for God, and who was not. And O, astonishing to tell, the priests and professors foamed out their spite, and discov-

---

* I suppose their wearing their *hats* had as good an effect as the dress and behaviour of a certain young man in the town of Pittsfield, who was unhappily deprived of his reason. Having got his father's frizzled wig, and filling his bosom with roasted potatoes, he went into a meeting-house, in time of sermon, with his wig on hind side before, which grieved some and made others laugh.

ered themselves to be enemies to the doctrines of the (Quakers) sacred, silent waiting; and above all, wearing the *hat*, and *thee* and *thou*, mortified and stung their proud hearts, and raised the persecuting spirit of *Cain*, *Esau*, *Judas;* they spit their malice, and thought to make us ashamed, but Quakers were stedfast." Page 30, &c. maintaining the purity and spirituality of their ordinances.—Who, I ask, does not see spirit and life in *thee* and *thou*, especially when it is spoken with the *hat* on? But, irony apart. These ordinances are a great cross to Quakers, as *Barcley* saith, page 532. "And this I can say boldly in the sight of God, from my own experience, and that of many thousands more; that however small or foolish this may seem, yet we behoved to choose death rather than do it."

No doubt this is a truth. It would be very painful for a sensible, well bred man or woman to violate the principles of good manners, and the ordinances of Christ too, for the shrewd, uncouth manners, and man-made ordinances of the Quakers. If they had a

thus saith the Lord, to plead in point of justification, it would be a sufficient reason; but *no;* it is only, *thus saith George Fox; and thus saith the teacher within me.*

It is a pity that Quakers did not see a difference between the cross of *Christ*, and the cross of *George Fox*, and that they did not follow Christ rather than George.

8th. The Quakers have assumed the *name* friends, to distinguish them from other denominations, whereas they are not *friends* to any, except their own order; and other denominations are as good friends to God or man as any of them; yea, better—for so saith Christ: "Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you." Now the Quakers reject the ordinances of Christ, therefore they transgress, while other denominations observe and do them, because they were commanded of the Lord. Moreover, other denominations have often attended the meetings of the Quakers, and allowed them to speak or preach in their meeting houses; hut when was it ever known that a Quaker allowed a minister of any other denomination to preach in their

meeting-house? Besides, it is contrary to their principles to have fellowship with any christians of any other order.

9th. The manner in which the Quakers explain their being led and taught by the spirit, and their bold censuring other ministers for preaching on all occasions (agreeable to the command, preach the word, be instant in season, out of season) with their constant practice, clearly proves them to be *eye-servants*. For they profess to be called of God to labour in *his vineyard*, and like an eye-servant that goes into the harvest field of the husbandman, he sits down lolling till he sees the master coming, then jumps up and goes to work till the master retires. So the Quakers go to meeting and sit down to wait for the *Master* —when he comes they arise and speak, and when he goes away they sit down again.— This shews that *their* spirit comes and goes like one of us. Besides their waiting for him shews that they were not led to meeting *by him;* or at least they had not a sufficient measure of the Spirit to speak for God. Then

they were like a messenger that has no message.

Their *silent* meetings are of a piece with the rest of their *ordinances*—institutions of man. They have no foundation in scripture: there is not one command in the Old or New Testament for them, unless they take that which our Lord commanded the devil: "Be still, and come out of him;" or what the Lord said to the raging heathen nations: "Be still and know that I am God." Ps. xlvi. 6—10. It would be well for Quakers to obey this, for there are but few of them that know the Lord, the most of them being only birthright Quakers, and they are very ignorant of God, they don't know him nor themselves. Their preachers are so taken up in teaching their *own* ordinances *(not the Lord's)* that they don't know *Christ* and *him crucified.* If they did, they would preach *his doctrine*, and come out from their *will worship*, their *man-made forms*, and obey the command of God, that he has given in these plain words: Ye *that make mention of the Lord keep* NOT SILENCE, but *raise your voice like a trumpet, and speak,*

whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear, and shew that silence is an abomination to the Lord, because he has not commanded it to Christians. Moreover, by this the Quakers deceive; for when they are silent, it is because they have not the SPIRIT; but when they arise to speak, they pretend that it is because they then have the immediate, powerful, teachings of the Spirit. Therefore the hearer thinks himself bound in duty to *receive* what he says as the unerring word of God: though the fact is, they often contradict what the Lord says by the prophets, Christ, and his apostles.

10th. The Quakers teach, that ministers ought not to receive money for preaching the gospel, thereby contradicting what the apostle saith, 1st Cor. ix. 14. "Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel."

Did they live up to their doctrine in this, it would be an high recommendation for them; but *alas!* It is not so—for they take money and say they *do not*, which looks like *untruth*. But when we hear their explanation we must

not judge them *quite so*. The reader may hear their defence thus: Suppose the yearly meeting in New-York wants some business done with the yearly meeting in one of the southern states, they will choose one or more of their members and entrust them with it. He is paid for doing business and not for preaching, though he preaches on his way.

Again, when the yearly meeting sends out any one to preach; they first examine him and make enquiry, as well as hear him. Then they wait for the moving of the Divine Spirit, so as to get divine approbation: and if they are agreed, they send him out to preach. He travels through their connection as is thought proper, and attends the quarterly meetings and monthly meetings, preaching, or holding silent meetings, as he thinks best; and if there is any business to be done, he attends to so much of it as is consistent with his mission, and receives pay for it, but not for *preaching*.

This defence shews that they receive *money*, but not for *preaching*. However, an honest man would not allow that such a defence

would screen them from all blame in judging other denominations, for that which they come so near to them in. Finally an honest man would call it *duplicity*, which is as soft a name for an *untruth* as can be found in the *English tongue*.

While Quakers support the poor of their own church, a minister of their order in want, is sure to have his wants supplied, because they are one class of their *poor*. For it is well known that they are very careful not to take any poor people, that they think will become chargeable, into their church. Therefore their preachers have a better supply.

11th. It is a general practice among the Quakers, to consider and receive their children in consequence of their birth, and call them birth-right members. There needs nothing more to be said on this to reprobate it, than what Barcley has said of the errors of the ancient Christian church, in page 276 and 277. "For the particular *Churches* of *Christ* gathered in the apostles' days, soon after beginning to decay as to the *inward life*, came to be overgrown with several errors; and the

hearts of the professors of *Christianity* to be leavened with the old spirit of the world." "For after that the princes of the earth came to take upon them that profession, and that it ceased to be a reproach to be a Christian, but rather became a means to preferment, men became such by birth and education and not by conversion and renovation of Spirit; then there was none so vile, none so wicked, none so profane, who became not a member of the church; and being enriched, and getting vast treasures and estates, became puffed up, and as it were, drunken with the vain pomp and glory of the world." Would Mr. Barcley have wrote this, if he had known that the Quakers would afterwards fall into the same error?

These are but a small part of the errors of the Quakers that might be noticed, and they are likely to increase in error; for if they continue to be Quakers, and to pursue their present system of principle and form of making their children members by birthright, their vile, wicked, profane lives will produce principles of Deism, if not of Atheism. O what

a lamentation ought every honest man to make for the dying and dead souls that are amongst us! the many that would lead moral lives, and love the Lord by keeping his commandments, but are taught by the Quakers to transgress and contemn the sacred law of God, and ordinances of Jesus Christ; the word of God is thought little of, while the writings of Fox and Barcley are taken by Quakers as a rule for faith and practice. People in general are willing to account them honest and religious, when they consider not that they are thieves and robbers; for they steal that day which belongs to God to serve themselves; they rob God of the sabbath which he has claimed for his own, and reject that form of godliness instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ. It is said by the apostle of some, "having a form of godliness and denying the power, from such turn away." It cannot be said that the Quakers have either the form, or the power of godliness: It is true they have a form, but what is it? It is not of Christ? It is not of God? It is contrary to the old and New Testament: From whom did they receive it?

From George Fox; and he says he had it by special command from God, but he has not proved it, and we are to prove all things; and hold fast that which is good: therefore their form is not a form of godliness; from such turn away; go not after them; for they cry, lo here! and lo there! and deny the Lord Jesus in his ordinances. O ye that believe there is a God, and believe ye have souls; would ye reject Christ's ordinances for those of George Fox? Would ye renounce the scriptures as the word of God, for the writings of a Fox, Barcley, Penn or Scott? Consider who it is that speaketh. If we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven, we shall not escape the righteous indignation of a holy God. O that they were wise, that they understood this; that they would consider their latter end! The resurrection of the body is a truth. A general judgment day will be the time of our latter end. O consider, it is not a light thing to transgress the holy law of God, no, not one command; for he that offendeth in one point is guilty of all: therefore remember this ye that violate the sabbath.

Was the reader of Fox's Journal, to notice in particular the first thirty-two pages, which contain an account of his first experience ; I dare not say experience of religion, for by that account he always had religion, even from a very small child ; and as to sin, I defy the reader to find the page or line where he expresses the least sin that was his own. He speaks of sin, and different sorts of sinners, and he was distrest about it, but in the 16th page, he "cried to the Lord, saying, Why should I be thus, seeing I was never addicted to commit those evils ?" He there complains of all classes of men as being very wicked ; he was afraid to associate with any, even professors, or the best christian ministers lest they would deceive and defile him ; and though he considers his father and mother to have been considered as very religious by all that knew them, when he was young, yet he does not give them any credit as being a means of any religious impressions on his mind. One hardly knows which he had the clearest sense of, his distress or his goodness ; his own clear understanding, or the gross darkness that cov-

ered every body else. But he was mightily encouraged to persevere in seeking more goodness, till at last he expresses himself thus, page 21, "Now was I come up in spirit "through the flaming sword into the paradise "of God. All things were new; and all the "creation gave another smell unto me than "before, beyond what words can utter; I "knew nothing but pureness, innocency, and "righteousness; being renewed up into the "image of God by Christ Jesus, I was come "up to the state of Adam which he was in "before he fell." The reader must see that George, from the account he gives of himself, was troubled with self-conceit, and self-willedness, or he could have had fellowship with some one, and conformed to some order; for if all were in darkness and living in open violation of the laws of God, he would have felt a sense of some guilt for some sin that he had committed at some time in his life. But no, he saith he never was addicted to commit those evils. Again, if he was in the state of Adam before he fell, he could not die, unless he committed a sin as Adam did; of course,

George is still alive, else he has committed sin, and if so, he is gone to hell. The Quakers say, George Fox is dead. Could Adam have ever died if he had not sinned? I answer, no—for by sin came death. So then, George was either deceived in his opinion of himself, or he is not dead, and if dead, and not deceived, he is in hell—Charity, therefore, compels the reader to believe he was deceived in his opinion of himself, and we cannot err in believing what charity justifies us in. We therefore must believe that George Fox, and of course, all the Quakers are deceived in their opinion of themselves. Yea, as much as the Pharisees of old, for like them, they verily think they are doing God service in being contrary to all professors of all denominations, and persecuting all other denominations, by accounting them as heathen men and publicans. They also use deceit, professing charity for other denominations, when they have none: they account it persecution for any one to speak against their forms of religion, while they speak and preach against all other denominations spiritedly, calling

their forms superstition, out of the true light, carnal ordinances. Is it not astonishing that Barcley and the Quakers reject the Fourth Commandment as a superstitious observance, declaring that neither the first nor seventh day of the week is the true Christian Sabbath? By which they openly and boldly reject the Fourth Commandment, even despising those that reprove them for it; and was it not for the civil authority would they not delight themselves in violating it merely to afflict and grieve the sincere and pious christian that fears God, and remembers the sabbath to keep it holy? Yes, this is well known by many, and were people to observe them as closely as they do other sinners, they would find them as bold violaters of the Fourth Commandment as the murderer is of the Sixth, or the adulterer is of the Seventh, or the thief is of the Eighth. Now if murderers, adulterers, and thieves get to heaven, then violaters of the Sabbath will get there too. But if there be a God, and if the scripture is a revelation of God to man, then the man that dies guilty of murder or adultery, &c. must have

his part in the lake that burns with fire and brimstone; so also the Quaker as well as any other person that dies guilty of a violation of the Fourth Command, to observe a day holy unto God, must be damned as sure as God is just and holy. Will Quakers still plead ignorance to justify them in abominable wickedness? "We know no moral obligation by the Fourth Commandment or elsewhere," saith Barcley. What stupid ignorance this is; exposed by one of their most learned writers.*

O that they would understand what they read? Many are concerned for them as well as for other sinners; for hard will be the lot of the self-willed and the profane! Were Quakers to make a plea at the bar of God, predicated on the principles they think most essential, would not this be the burden of their cry, Lord, Lord open unto us. Have we not spoken in thy name, and hast thou not been with

---

* For an obligation to observe the Sabbath, read *Isaiah* lvi. 2, 6.—lviii. 13. *Jer.* xvii. 21, 27. *Ezek.* xx. 13, 20. *Nehem.* xiii. 15, 21. *Mark* ii. 27, 28.

and taught us by thy spirit? And have we not honoured thee by saying, *thee* and *thou* to a single person, and by wearing our hats, denying those ordinances which many other denominations were so zealous in attending to, in particular, Baptism and the Lord's Supper? And did we not cry out against the observance of the Sabbath day? Thereby holding up a more spiritual meaning, alluding to this state of rest with thee, therefore, Lord, Lord open unto us. We denied ourselves of all those ordinances other denominations were distinguished by; we suffered many things for wearing our hats and saying *thee* and *thou;* it was a great cross to deny ourselves; "Many of us behoved to chose death rather than do it." We suffered imprisonment and scourging; yea, we took joyfully the spoiling of our goods, "rather than so satisfy the proud humour of proud men" as to uncover our heads. Besides many of us were prosecuted by the laws of our country, for not observing the Sabbath day to keep it holy, and suffered the loss of our property in fines for violating the laws of the sabbath, and other institutions

both civil and religious; especially those institutions that supported the priests; insomuch that we were contrary to all men, and did not join with any to worship God, but ourselves. Therefore, Lord, Lord open unto us. O consider, Lord, did we not see into the seventh Seal? That solemn silence there discovered, though it was contrary to that text of scripture, where it says, *Ye that make mention of the Lord keep not silence*, yet we saw such solemn silence in that seal that we thought it the highest attainment in thy favour to worship silently. Yea, so did we believe in silence, that we enforced it in all our exhortations. That was the essential theme, we loved it, we almost adored, many of us did worship it; it was our *ne plus ultra*. Moreover we despised and reproved the opinion that ministers should preach on all occasions, or that christians should sing and make a joyful noise, though the Scripture did say to ministers, Lift up your voice like a trumpet. Be instant in season out of season; and to christians, O clap your hands, all ye people, shout unto God with the voice of triumph, but this was only scrip-

ture. We saw further and did not believe this was required of us; neither did we believe the scripture was the word of God to us. We had a spirit—Therefore, Lord, Lord, open unto us.

If Quakers were to plead what they believe to be the most essential in point of justification at the bar of God, would not the above be the substance of their plea, though now they would be ashamed to expose their weakness with such a presumptuous shameful plea.

THUS ends the pamphlet—with a form of prayer predicated on the principles which the Quakers esteem most essential. And though much has been said by the Quakers against the charges in the pamphlet, yet none have ever explained to me the impropriety of the above form of prayer; except they look upon it as something ridiculous. All that is true enough. But none can deny that it is consistent with the spirit and principle of quakerism. And if it is consistent with their prin-

ciple and spirit, why not practised, though ridiculous? that their practice may be consistent with their profession.

After the publication of the above pamphlet, and it began to spread, the great cry of the Quakers was, (as the Philistines said when Sampson burnt their corn) Who has done this? For it was easy to be seen that it had set their quarter, monthly, and preparatory meetings all on fire; and was like to burn up much stubble. And when they knew that I was the author, they were ready to do to me; not as the Philistines did to Sampson, viz. to burn my wife and her father with fire: but they strove to destroy my ministerial and moral character, and thereby prevent my usefulness in those parts. In this they failed for want of matter to work upon. However, they made a great talk; and I was one great subject of talk at all their meetings and tea-tables throughout the town and country where the book had spread. Some denied the truth of the charges; others condemned the style in which it was wrote; and all agreed to say that I had no charity. Little do they consid-

er that charity is love. Had they known this, they would own that I had love enough for the Quakers to obey that command, Levit. xix. 17. "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart; thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbour, and not suffer sin upon him."—And also, that I had love enough for the gospel, to obey (as I was able) that command, Tim. iv. "I charge thee, therefore, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, preach the word, reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long suffering and doctrine; for the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine." (Titus i. 13.) "Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith; not giving heed to fables, and commandments of men that turn from the truth."

But, alas! the Quakers were so disturbed by the truth that they forgot themselves; for instead of confessing their error like men of candour, or producing authority for their assertions, many of them were bold to raise and foment dirty stories against the supposed author, as though personal invectives and ballad songs were good arguments. It is a fact this

was all they used for some time to ward off the force of truths that made their ears to tingle. But their ballad songs and dirty stories could not invalidate the truth, nor produce any thing better than pity for them; for all that were acquainted with me, readily see into the cause of this great talk, and were constrained to say that the pamphlet had disturbed the Quakers very much. As for myself, I did not much mind their stories nor their songs, for I remembered that my Master had been spit upon, and they said of him, "He is mad and hath a devil, why hear ye him?" And "if they have done this in the green tree, what will they do in the dry." So I expect that like characters will say as much, or more of me. But still I love the Quakers and labour to reform them, by the lawful means of addressing to them a statement of their errors; and though I suffer much in the labour, I am sure it will not be altogether in vain, for God is with me: and therefore I hope some will be reformed, and others restrained from superstitious wickedness.

However, though the Quakers at first beset

me round like bulls, yea. like strong bulls of Bashan : they gaped upon me with their mouths, as a ravening and a roaring lion, (Psalm xxii.) until the month of April, when they sent me a letter of challenge to come forth in public, and substantiate the charges in the pamphlet. After requiring of them an explanation of this letter to me, and understanding that the two men that sent me the letter were (what they called) spiritual elders, and men that were highly esteemed among the Quakers and others, I was the more willing to except the challenge.

The letters that passed between the two Quaker elders and me, were as follow ; their first letter was in these words :

New-Rochelle, 4th. Month, 3d, 1809.

Having seen a pamphlet, entitled Errors of the Quakers, of which thou art the reputed author, and considering the society of which we are members, calumniated, and falsely charged therein ; we, as individuals, call on thee to substantiate those charges publicly, and leave it to thee to fix some convenient place and time in this week for that purpose,

and we will meet thee; fifth day excepted, that being our meeting day.

JAMES MOTT,
SAMUEL TITUS.

To. Wm. HIBBARD.

To which I sent the following.

New-Rochelle, April 4, 1809.

I received your letter this evening, in which you call upon me to substantiate those charges publicly, that appear in a pamphlet entitled Errors of the Quakers, of which I am the author. But as you have not designated any one or two charges as false, I know not by this what you would require. If you mean that all the charges in the pamphlet are false, I want you to say so; and if a part of them are false, say which they are. I know not of one charge that is false.

Also, I want an explanation of the word publicly. You call on me to substantiate those charges publicly. I think I have done that already. However, as you do not come forward in behalf of your society, or in behalf of the public, I am willing to correspond with you by letter; or should be happy to wait on

you at my house, to converse in friendship on the subject. I am sincere in my opinion of the things I stated in that pamphlet, that they are all true. However, if you can convince me to the contrary, I should be thankful, for I am not willing to remain ignorant of a mistake, if it can be explained.

I am

To J—— M——. B. H.
S—— T——.

Here followed a Poscript, informing them that the bearer would inform them what time they could call upon me.

LETTER II.

New-Rochelle, 4th Month, 10th, 1809.

In reply to thine of 4th inst. we will just say, If thou didst not understand by ours of 3d what we required, we will now endeavour to inform thee, what we then had, and now have in view.

It is, that thou meet us at some suitable place in the neighbourhood of New-Rochelle, there to substantiate, or in other words prove the truth of those charges published by thee in a pamphlet entitled " Errors of the Quak-

ers," and this proof to be made in the presence of those of thy own society in and about New-Rochelle, and others that may be invited. For as our own society, and consequently we as members thereof are publicly accused by thee, of things that we deny the truth of, we therefore have no idea of a private conference, or any correspondence with thee by letter, in order for explanation on the subject; but claim of thee public proof as due for public accusations. And we hope on reading this thou wilt understand what we mean by the word "Public."

Thou wishest to know whether all, or which of the charges we think to be false. We apprehend there will be no difficulty in finding them. Thou also says, "You call on me to substantiate those charges publicly, I think I have done that already." Were assertions proof thou hast done it, but we conceive there is a wide difference between asserting and substantiating—and it is the latter we now call upon thee to do, and in the public manner above proposed.

To B—— H——.

J—— M——
S—— T——.

By this letter the reader will perceive that I am the accused person, of course on the defensive. To this I wrote as follows :

New-Rochelle, April 11, 1809.

I have just received your letter of the 10th inst. This is to inform you that I have appointed a meeting to be in the Methodist meeting-house, in this town, on Friday the 21st inst at one o'clock, P. M. for the purpose of reading the pamphlet entitled, "Errors of the Quakers," and explaining or shewing that the arguments prove the charges or assertions therein stated. I don't expect to be interrupted by having any questions asked, till I have done reading, and remarking on what I read; then you, or any of your preachers, may object as you think proper: And after you have assigned your reasons for your objections, I expect to inquire your definite meaning, (if I should not understand you) and make my reply. You will have the same liberty to inquire of me, &c.

I wish every thing done with decorum and honesty, hoping the Lord may solemnize our

spirits. And feeling a sense of my motto, I subscribe myself your friend

To J—— M——. B—— H——.
S—— T——.

P. S. I wish all the people of your society (that can) to attend.

This I expected would be an end of our correspondence, inasmuch as I had complied with their request, and had the publication read in two or three congregations the next sabbath, stating particularly in each the cause and order of the meeting. But on the 19th I received the following letter from them, dated

New-Rochelle, 4th mo. 17th 1809.

Thine of 11th instant came to hand last evening, informing that thou had appointed a meeting on the 21st at the Methodist meeting-house in New-Rochelle thou sayest, "for the purpose of reading the pamphlet entitled Errors of the Quakers; and explaining or shewing that the arguments prove the charges or assertions therein stated. Also, that thou don't expect to be interrupted by any questions being asked till thou hast done reading and remarking on what thou reads.

If health permits, we shall meet thee at the time and place appointed.

We dont call on thee to read thy book, nor do we intend to yield to thy terms as an introduction to the discussion, but we shall in the first place claim the liberty as our due, and not as an indulgence, to state the particular charges one after another, that we say are not true, in order that thou may have a fair opportunity of proving them either by scripture, or such other authorities as are entitled to due credit; for the point in question* is the simple proof of those assertions that we shall name to thee out of thy book.

We consider ourselves the injured party; therefore as in the case of an individual, when he thinks himself falsely accused, he repeats the accusation, and then the accuser in his turn is at liberty to prove or substantiate his assertions: and this is the mode of procedure we shall expect in this business, and which is the only method that we think fair and hon-

---

* Quite a mistake, for this had not been a question either exprest or implied by them.

ourable, and by which the truth can be made to appear: the truth being manifest is our object.

With a hope that the decorum and honesty thou alludest to will be observed by us and thee, we subscribe ourselves thy friends.

J—— M——.
To B. H. S—— T——.

To this I wrote as follows:

New-Rochelle, April 20th, 1809.

I returned from my journey to Dutchess County last night, and received your letter of the 17th inst. informing me that you dont intend to yield to my terms of introduction to the discussion.

This is to inform you, that you cannot from the principles of justice and honour, prescribe rules for me. After I called on you to designate the charges that were false, and you declined it, but still insisted on my substantiating the charges publicly, and did not state a form of procedure; I consider, that it was wholly left to me to chose the mode I think is best to vindicate myself, and substantiate or shew the truth of the charges stated in the pamphlet.

It is the public you request me to satisfy—and you would meet me, you dont say to ask any questions, or conduct the order of the meeting; and now, after I had appointed the meeting, as I understood you requested, and stated publicly the order it would be attended, which was my prerogative to do; you have no right to oppose the authority you request me to exercise, which was, to appoint a meeting (for myself) to prove the truth of those charges against the Quakers in the pamphlet, entitled Errors of the Quakers: therefore I shall not disappoint the public, who are notified of the meeting and the order, by altering the mode of procedure. It is my most earnest desire to get good and do good; so is the language of Job (xxi. 3.) I must say, "Suffer me that I may speak, and after I have spoken, mock on."

I am your friend for Christ's sake,

To J—— M——. B. H.
S—— T——.

I considered their last letter as an attempt to mock me—for to accuse me of writing falsehood, and call on me to vindicate myself, and saying, that the "point in question *was* the

simple proof of those charges we shall name to thee out of thy book"—when it had never been a question, viz. to answer to the charges they shall name to me ; and to trump this up after the appointment was given out, shews that they meant something they had not expressed.

However, we met on the day and time appointed. The reader will see in the address to James Mott and Samuel Titus, the result of the meeting. I have endeavoured to notice all the particulars in as minute and concise a manner as my memory would serve in that address, which address I wish to be considered as intended to be to the whole body of Quakers, that if any of them can prove one charge false, they are at liberty to address their refutation to me : but don't bring up your say so, or bare denial of the truth of the charges, as a proof of their falsehood.

I have not charged the Quakers with any thing but what I can substantiate ; and I defy them to prove one charge false, or give any good reason why it is not strictly true.

But don't set your dogs on me, as though

you would hunt me out of the field of controversy; I am not as yet frightened with deists, nor half cut deists with their ballad songs, barking for Quakers against the truths of the pamphlet. I am sorry that Quakers have employed no better friends to vindicate their cause than deists and ballad singers.

I did not take my pen to vindicate my own character, nor the Methodists as a denomination, or any other persuasion of people in particular, but to plead the much injured cause of him who said, "Eat, this is my body;" and who also said, "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth; go ye, therefore, teach all nations, baptizing them:" and to wipe off the approbrium cast upon it by Quaker dotages.

I might have wrote better and treated the subject in a better manner if I had known of one; but I have done the best I could in the fear of God, and not of man: if any one can do better, let him try; I submit this as an address to the Quakers, knowing that I must stand with them in one day before the bar of God, and there answer for what I have done.

An address to James Mott and Samuel Titus.

SIRS,

I am very sensible that you were sincere, in calling on me in your letters of the 3d and 10th of April, to substantiate the charges in the pamphlet, entitled "Errors of the Quakers," and that you thought yourselves injured, and the people or society, of which you are members, calumniated and falsely charged by the author of the pamphlet; and I expect your wish was in this affair, to take such a method as would best serve to wipe away the roproach you lay under by reason of the charges in the pamphlet, and to do away or prevent the influence it was like to have on the public mind.

But though I can frankly assure you, that I feel a great regard and love for you, and for the people to which you are united: also, I believe there are some things in your economy that are good in their nature; but I also know teat there are many errors, both in your principles and your forms of worship; and that your late attempts to detect me for exposing your errors were unwise and unfair, of course

ineffectual. It was unfair, because you exprest one mode of discussing the subject and meant another: it was unwise, because when you were invited to a friendly conversation or correspondence, whereby you might have tried your strength, and thereby see whether you was able to stand against the strength you challenged before you exposed your weakness; but you refused both.

I am not disposed however to blame you, without a heart felt sense of pity and concern for you; because you have been accustomed to think for a long time that your principles were agreeable to scripture; but the charges in the pamphlet clearly proved them erroneous; and if you did not deny the truth of the charges, you must reform, or appear very absurd to every man of sense: and as you have been long in the habit of thinking you were right, till you had imbibed a strong prepossession in favour of your sentiment, you were not willing to reform in opinion without more evidence of your error. Therefore you challenged me to substantiate the charges.

However favorable I may think of your mo-

tives in attempting to justify your society, and exculpate them from the guilt of the charges, honesty and truth obliges me to say, as my opinion, that your conduct in this affair, is as contrary to Christian candour as your society appear to be by the charges in the pamphlet; and will only serve as another argument to prove the truth of those charges, though there was truth enough without it.

It is taken for granted, that you hold to that gospel rule which enjoins, "As ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them:" therefore, as you expected that I should make a public acknowledgment, if I failed to prove the charges true, because if the charges were false, you as a people were calumniated, so I in turn expect that if you do not prove the charges false, (having accused me with writing falsehood) you should make your confession. And I did not fail on my part to prove with implicit evidence, in the clearest manner, every charge in the pamphlet; and when I had gotten through, I challenged the Quakers to prove one charge false, declaring at the same time, that if you

did not prove one or more charges false, I should consider your accusation a vile slander of my character; for I consider that your charging me with falsehood wrongfully, was as bad as if I had charged you wrongfully; and if you would prove one charge false, I would write an acknowledgment of my fault, and print and circulate it as freely as I circulated the pamphlet: but you acknowledged before the congregation three times in the course of the afternoon, that you could not prove them false; but still you insist upon it that they are false. This is not candid.

I might notice the method you took in visiting my Methodist brethren, to convince them that the charges were false and thereby prejudice them against me; also, the countenance you gave to a Deistical man, to write and print a vindication of the Quakers, in answer to the pamphlet, in which (I am informed) he has allowed the truth of the charges, but blames me for my opinion of your principles; and then closes with (what I think is) Tom Paine's creed of Deism. I have not read the book, because the author only intended it

as an imposition, or he would not have inscribed it to me without sending me one to read. I was informed, however, that you examined the manuscript of A—— D—— Esq. whom I was informed, is a profest Deist, before it went to the press ; and, from what I can learn, your society are pretty generally satisfied with it as an answer to the pamphlet; however, I am confident that you and the more sensible part of your community disapprove of it. Was it not so, I should conclude that you were in as great a strait as old king Saul was when the Lord disowned him, and he could get no answer from him ; therefore he applied to the Witch of Endor to bring up the prophet Samuel : you in like manner, would have been guilty of a similar evil ; for I think you would not say that Mr. D—— was a friend to the Quaker religion, or any other principle, than the Witch of Endor was a friend to Saul, namely, because he had left the Lord : and I am sure that Saul would not have applied to a witch to help him if God had not disowned him. But what will a man or people do, when God has forsaken them.

I might notice many other things that were said and done by you and others before we met; but I pass over them to notice the transactions of the meeting.

After we met on the day appointed, I opened the meeting with solemn prayer to God, and you all sat on your seats with your hats on: after prayer I read the letters of correspondence, to shew those of the congregation that were then present the cause and order of the meeting: after that, I observed that I should proceed to read the pamphlet, and make some few remarks thereon, as notified in the appointment, quoting the words of our Lord to the lawyer, Luke x. 26. "What is written in the law, how readest thou?" as a reason for reading the pamphlet; inferring from the text, that as some in the days of old did not understand the law, because they did not read right, so now some do not understand this pamphlet, and I think it is because they have not read right; therefore I shall read the pamphlet. I then proceeded to read, and none interrupted till I had nearly half done; by this time the congregation were all gather-

ed into the meeting-house: then your speaker, *Mr. Franklin*, arose and said to the congregation: "It is unfair and unjust for him to read the book: we did not come here to hear the book, but to have him prove the truth of those charges we shall name to him out of the book:" and five of your brethren arose one after the other, and joined him to say it was unfair and unjust, &c. and you desired me to leave it to the congregation, to judge whether I should read the book or not. But this I refused, for neither you or the congregation had any right to chuse the mode wherein I should vindicate myself from the charge you had made against me. However, after I had read a second time your letter of the 10th, and remarked on the other letters; shewing that I had not taken any step but what the principle in your letters required, if I accepted your challenge, I observed that I was a plain man, and a lover of honesty; and having published the order of the meeting, I could not honestly alter the mode of procedure: you then consented to the justness of my procedure, and desired your friends to submit to it with patience:

though you had hindered me nearly three quarters of an hour, you were now willing to hear the rest of the book with patience, pulling down one of your brethren that was engaged to continue the disturbance, saying to him with a loud whisper, "It is out of order." I then proceeded to read and remark on the rest of the pamphlet; and when I had done addressing you and the congregation I sat down, and looked at my watch and it had been only two hours and thirty minutes from the time I met you in the yard before the meeting-house door, to the time I sat down. Now, on a review of this transaction, would you not say that I have reason to believe, that you meant to take advantage of the ignorance of that part of the congregation that were not present when I first read the letters of correspondence, to impress their minds with an idea that I was not treating you with that just privilege which the principles in those letters allowed you? And have I not reason also to believe, that when *Mr. Franklin* afterwards complained to the congregation that you had not a fair chance, that you had waited with

patience three or four hours, for me to read and animadvert on what I read, strained the truth by saying three or four hours, seeing you hindered me nearly three quarters of an hour. But this proves you were very zealous.

You complain of me, and say, that you had not time to prove what you wanted to, or say what you could have said: but it is a fact that you had time for eight of your society to speak once or twice each, and some of them made pretty long speeches, besides reading detached parts of a number of books you brought to help you along. But your reading was as far from an argument in point, as your speeches were; though you read and talked as well as you could, the congregation at the same time giving good attention to what we all said; and when the sun was about an hour high you all sat down in silence. Whether you had spun out all you had to say, or whether you was about to give over, I cannot determine; at any rate, you all sat down in silence for some time, and you might have sat till sun down for all my saying a word; for I had said what I thought was

sufficient for the place, time, and purpose. But for you to complain of me for not giving you time enough, when you did not improve what you had, looks odd.

The charge in the pamphlet which you first disputed the truth of, was: "Though they say they have an high opinion of the holy scripture, it is evident that they have an higher opinion of the writings of Fox, Barcley, and other Quaker writers."

This you said was not true, and wished me to prove or substantiate the truth of it: I then read the note I had written for a vindication of that charge, and which I had before read in the congregation, thus: "I find on reading the discipline of the Quakers, that they allude to the testimony of their predecessors, and enforce the obligation to observe those rules that are peculiar to them as a people, from the testimony of their ancestors, and not from scripture; and that Quakers, by attempting to disannul the moral obligation to observe either the first or seventh day of the week as a sabbath unto the Lord; and also rejecting the ordinances of Christ; instituting ordinances for religious

worship without scripture authority, clearly proves that they esteem the writings of Quakers above the scripture."

However, you said that you had a higher opinion of the scripture than of any other writings whatever: but your say so don't prove it. You read in one of your authors that he esteemed the scripture above any other book whatever: but his say so, don't prove it. Because you have not in your discipline, or any of your writings or sayings, whatever profest to believe that the scripture is a sufficient rule for faith and practice: and until you profess this by an article binding you to esteem the scripture in this point of light, I, nor any other person or people cannot give you that credit, and remain honest men ourselves; because you flatly contradict the scripture ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, as held forth by the apostles; for *Peter* saith, Acts ii. 38: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost:" and of some that had received the Holy Ghost, Acts

x. 47, 48, he saith: "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we: and he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." This is as plain as A B C—so also is that concerning the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, by St. Paul: he saith to the Corinthians, Chap. xi. 23: "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you; that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks he brake it and said, Take, eat, this is my body," &c. But this the Quakers deny as an ordinance binding on us, though the apostle saith he received it from the Lord; and Ignatius saith of some that *were contrary to the design of God by abstaining from the sacrament—they die in their disputes.* So Quakers deny the authority of scripture ordinances, and set up *Fox* and *Barcley* for their oracles; and I fear they'll die in their disputes. But to return to the narration.

The method *Mr. Franklin* took to prove your high regard for the scripture, was truly

novel. He arose and began thus: "We have an high opinion of the scriptures, though we dont call it the WORD of God; yet it contains the WORDS of God: we call Christ the WORD, as it is written, the WORD was from the beginning, the WORD was with God, and the WORD was God." And then he said: "The word took flesh and dwelt among men; the scriptures did not take flesh and dwell among men, therefore the scripture is not the WORD of God." He then proceeded to show the powerful and good effects of the Word, and enlarged upon the necessity of having this Word in the soul, and was pretty lengthy on this head of his discourse; so I cannot say but it was a good exhortation, though no argument to the point in question. However, when he had done and sat down, I asked if I understood him right to say the WORD TOOK FLESH; three of your brethren spoke, and owned that he said the WORD TOOK Flesh: one of you said, "That is the express word." I then read the text, "The WORD was MADE FLESH;" and said, that friend *Franklin* had

perverted the text, by saying the WORD TOOK flesh. I then shewed the perversion by saying, If we say the WORD was made flesh, then we can say truly that FLESH is the WORD; but if we say, the WORD TOOK flesh, we cannot in truth say that flesh is the WORD: so when God speaks to us in human language, that human language is the word of God to us. I then quoted 1 Thess. ii. 13: "For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because when ye received the WORD of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the WORD of man, but as it is in truth the WORD of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe." This word was spoken with human tongues, and was heard with human ears; and it was the WORD of God in human language. I also quoted Heb. i. 1, 2: this clearly proves that the scripture is the WORD of God, and ought to be regarded as a rule for faith and practice. But for the Quakers to deny this, is giving Moses and the Prophets the lie; for they say: *Hear ye the WORD of the Lord—Thus saith the Lord.* Now if what they said

was not the WORD of the Lord, then they lied, for they said it was: and for the Quakers to thus indirectly tell the inspired writers they lie, is a corruption of good manners. Neither will their pretension to inspiration excuse their folly in this matter; for if a man pretends to inspiration, the one of two things he must do to save himself from just censure: 1st. He must prove his mission by working miracles; or, 2d, He must preach according to the words of those prophets and apostles, that proved their mission by miracles; if he fails in both these, he is deceived: and if the Quakers have either of these marks I wish they would show it.

It is well known that the Quakers are accustomed to say that the scriptures are a dead letter, and the outward institutions or ordinances of our Lord are a dead letter; and the word that is written with ink and pen, or preached unto us with human tongues, is all dead letter. But I know the deadness is in them: they are dead to the principle of divine grace held forth in the scripture. The scripture is not dead: no, blessed be God—the

preaching of the word, though a stumbling block to the Quakers, it is the power of God to them that believe.—I know it, and many others also can testify that when they heard the word with a heart consenting to the principles held forth in the word, it wrought in them conviction for sin, and desire to serve God; and when they obeyed the command to seek the Lord, he was found of them, and revealed the Son of his love in their souls; they then became witnesses for Jesus, that his word was spirit and it was life to them. But without this experience it is impossible to bear such witness; therefore all strangers to experimental religion will judge of the word and Spirit of God as the blind judge of colours, or the deaf of sounds: yea, it will not be strange if they say it is a dead letter; for a man can say of the living they are dead, and of the dead they are living; as well as some who call darkness light, and light darkness; or evil good, and good evil: but it only proves that they are blind to the light, and dead to the word of God themselves.

Is it not a pity that the Quakers did not see

a difference between the ceremonial law and the moral law, and also between the outward ordinances under the Mosaic dispensation, and those of Christ? Methinks they would not account the outward ordinances of our Lord Jesus Christ disannulled or dead, because those of Moses were: but it has happened unto them according to the prophecy, they will not endure sound doctrine; for they have made the commandments of God of none effect by their traditions. Their ignorance, however, respecting the scripture word and ordinances, and their calling them dead, &c. reminds me of the ignorance of a little child: the child had observed her grandmother to be very devout in prayer to God for some time, at length she desisted from the practice, and the child, not knowing the cause, asked her grandmother in a mournful accent if God was dead; the grandmother said, No, child, God is not dead. Why, said the child, you used to pray to him, and you have not prayed for a good while, and I thought he was dead: the old woman burst into tears, and confest that it was she that was dead. I

wish the Quakers were as candid as that old woman, then they would rise in the wisdom of the scripture, and of God, above the ignorance of a little child.

You complained of me before the congregation, that I had represented your wearing your hat, in a light and trifling manner: you said it was unbecoming a minister in my standing, and you were so sincere in your complaint, and appeared to be so grieved, that I thought you merited the commiseration of every man of feeling present. Well, I acknowledge that I wrote a little irony in saying, "Who does not see spirit and life in *thee* and *thou*, especially when spoken with the hat on;" but this I wrote in sincerity for a serious purpose, because, 1st. The Quakers deny all outward ordinances, even those instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, and have (I trust) ignorantly called them carnal ordinances; and the ministers and people that worship God in the use of those ordinances, they profusely call *blind*, *carnal*, *not yet in the true light*, *enemies to them*. 2d. They have instituted ordinances

which they call significations,* such as uncovering their head, and saying thee and thou, and those they say are not outward ordinances; they must then be spiritual: and though I have asked many of them to give the spiritual meaning of *thee* and *thou*, or *of pulling off the hat*, none of them have as yet satisfied my mind about it; though they have plead for what they call the plain language, and wearing the hat, as things that were sacred. They cannot say that the scripture affords any command for it; but the ancient Quakers took a notion that they could worship God better in this way, than in the old forms and customs of the church, therefore they adopted it; and the great persecution they suffered for it, they now plead to prove the institution sacred. We must acknowledge that the Quakers have suf-

* A signification is an ordinance, because an ordinance signifies something intended by it, and not the thing itself: if this is not a true definition of the words, then pulling off the hat is a real worship of God; and if so, other denominations worship God more than the Quakers, because they uncover their heads all the time of meeting.

fered great persecution for their hat, if we believe *Barcley* and *Fox;* for *Barcley* says, *Many of us have suffered beating, buffeting, imprisonment;* and *Fox* says, *blows and punching.* But we cannot say in truth that this persecution was for righteousness' sake.

Indeed, an observing reader of *Fox's* Journal can easily see that the first and most of the persecution the Quakers met with, was on account of their *hat*, and uncharitably judging others: as for instance, their going into the meetings of other denominations in time of worship with their hats on; and sometimes saying to the minister while he was preaching, "Come down, thou deceiver." All this was calculated to disturb the people in their devotion, and produce opposition against the Quakers, and that on the most justifiable principles too; for Quakers have no more right to disturb other denominations in their religious worship, than other denominations have to disturb them. But they did disturb not only religious assemblies but the courts of justice, by wearing their hats, and they meant to disturb them, and gloried in the persecution they

met with for it. Yes, if we believe *Fox*, they sacrificed and suffered and took joyfully the spoiling of their goods. Now, though their sacrificing and suffering was not greater, in my opinion, than the sufferings and sacrifices of Baal's prophets for their false god, as we read in 1 Kings xviii. yet it proves clearly that Quakers have as really suffered and sacrificed for their hat as Baal's prophets did to their god; and if Elijah, the prophet of the Lord, was justifiable in his ironacle speech, which was called mocking Baal's prophets for worshipping such a god, I think I am justifiable for mocking the vain idolatrous notion of the Quakers in the matter of their hat.

If any should blame me for representing the Quakers as believing the institution of the hat as something sacred or essential to religious fellowship, I would refer them to *Barcley* and the Quaker discipline; for *Barcley* says, that uncovering the head is one of the outward significations of their adoration; and in their discipline, page 15th, they have made this regulation concerning the *hat*: "None are to take upon them publicly to oppose any

ministering friend; or in time of prayer keep on the hat, or shew any remarkable dislike; but if any think they have aught against what was delivered, they are to speak to them privately, &c." By this we see that Quakers think much of wearing the hat, as also of uncovering the head—by keeping on the hat in time of prayer, they tell their disapprobation of what is said, and of the speaker too: and this mode of telling their displeasure is so harsh in their opinion, that they have forbid the practice of it in their own meetings; by this rule of discipline, uncovering the head is a mark of fellowship. Now if they would forbid their wearing their hat in time of prayer, when they happen to attend (though it is not often) with other denominations, it would make them in one thing consistent with their notion of charity; but inasmuch as they do not, it proves (as I said in the meeting) as clear as two and two makes four, the truth of that charge in the pamphlet, which says, "Quakers have no fellowship with any christian of any other order;" besides, it is a mode of shewing their dislike. People in different

ages have practised different modes of shewing their dislike to religion; we read of some that would *shute out the lip*, and others that would *gnash upon the speaker with his teeth:* I must allow that the Quaker mode is the most handsome and decent; though (in their opinion) too harsh to be practised in their meetings.

But for Quakers to plead the sufferings of their ancestors to justify their hot zeal for their hat, clearly shows that they esteem it a sacred signification; especially if we consider that it is natural for people to believe that when a man suffers for what he thinks to be right, that the principle or form that he suffers for must be right for him, and because the humane rulers that once persecuted the Quakers for their hat, desisted from the practice—because they would not prosecute with rigor every foolish practice, many suppose that the notion of the hat has gained the applause of wise men.

The apostle Paul did not judge that suffering would sanctify any principle, when he said, "And though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me

nothing." 1 Cor. 13. By this the apostle considers charity as the all important virtue that qualifies for *heaven*. But charity is love to God. Not mere alms-giving. For he saith: "And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and have not charity, &c." Now if we consider charity to be love to God and our fellow men, and the words of the apostle John to be true, chap. v. 3, "For this is the love of God that we keep his commandments, &c." how can we say that the Quakers have charity, seeing they reject the commandments of the Lord to set up their own traditions. And how can we have charity or love for them if we neglect to reprove them for their sin, since God has expressly commanded, saying, "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart; but thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbour, and not suffer sin upon him." O, my dear sirs, I beseech you to consider that charity does not consist in our having a good opinion of all the whimsical notions of our friends or brethren; but it consists in keeping the commandments of God.

You denied the truth of the charge in the

pamphlet, page 15, where I say of your preachers, "He is paid for doing business, but not for preaching." Or, "They take money, and say they do not." You said I could not prove this: I think I did prove it clearly, with quotations from your discipline. If you mean any thing by your articles for *suffering* (as you call it) and for the *poor*, you must mean to make a good provision for your preachers. I spoke first of your article for sufferings, in Discipline page 137. The article reads thus:

"The meeting for sufferings was appointed by the yearly meeting in 1758. And the year following the subject more fully engaging attention, the meeting for sufferings was established, and the services thereof more fully stated as appears from the following minute, viz. The meeting for sufferings are to take under their consideration the cases of any of our brethren who are subject to sufferings for the testimony of truth, and represent such cases as they may thi n proper to those in authority in order to obtain redress. To pay attention to any bills that may be brought forward in the Legislature that may be likely to affect

our religious testimony, and to make application when they may judge proper. The said meeting for sufferings is to be considered as representatives on behalf of the yearly meeting, and to appear in any matter where the interest and reputation of truth may render it necessary: And as there may be sometimes a necessary expence attending the transaction of some part of their businesss, the treasurer is requested to furnish the said meeting with money necessary for such SERVICES."

Note, there is nothing in your discipline that prohibits a preacher from being a member of this meeting; and the members of this meeting are allowed by this *article* to take pay for their services. Besides, the duty of those members appointed to the office described in the *article*, are to take under consideration the case of any brethren that are subjected to suffering for the testimony of truth, and to make application as they judge proper. Who does not see that your preachers, seeing they are indemnified for all their sufferings in their *testimony of truth*, are well paid for preaching, inasmuch as *testimony of truth* is intended to mean the same thing as *preaching the gospel.*

Your *article* for the *poor* does not contradict the sense I have given to the above *article;* but clearly proves it. I would here insert the whole of the article for the poor, as I read it in the meeting, having extracted it from your discipline, page 77, 78, 79, but it is some what long; and you, with the public, will believe me, when I say, that it contains a very good, and a very earnest exhortation to the "*Monthly meeting to attend closely to the collection*," as it says, "*with a liberality that will keep it in a situation suitable to the necessary expences that may arise, and thereby avoid the painful necessity of resorting to a particular personal subscription, either for the relief of the poor or otherwise.*" Then it recommends this business to the "*care and superintendance of the meeting for suffering.*" So that one would be ready to conclude that you had a great many poor, or made a rich provision for a few, or else you were hard put to it to make your members liberal in works of charity and mercy. But the last clause of the *article* fixes your sense of the whole, and spoils all such conclusions; for that says: "*The above min-*

ute (or article) *is not to be understood as contemplating the ordinary relief of the poor, but only a disproportionate expence that some more remote monthly meetings may be put to by extra services in lengthy journies, or otherwise.*"— Here some are to be paid for services in lengthy journies, or otherwise. What does this mean? Does it mean in coming to the yearly meeting, or waiting on the preachers from one monthly meeting to another? Or does the word otherwise added to services, mean to give liberty to the members of the meeting for sufferings, to whose care the business is submitted, to pay or relieve the preachers for their sufferings for the testimony of truth? It cannot mean the expence of building houses or promoting schools, for neither of these are mentioned in either of the *articles:* and as the meeting for sufferings are directed to take the business under their superintendence, we must conclude that they are to make application according to that *article*, and the last clause of this *article*, viz: to pay *services.*

This *article*, however, makes some provi-

sion for the poor; but it says, "*not an ordinary relief.*" Your *ordinary relief* is pointed out in Discipline, page 7, thus: "*That each monthly meeting appoint a treasurer, and have a collection quarterly to provide for the relief of the necessitous, and other purposes of the meeting.*"

In all your articles of discipline, the reader may see an ambiguous mode of expression. You don't say in plain words, that your preachers shall be paid a certain salary, but it is so exprest that they can be (and no doubt are) richly supplied, under an idea that they have suffered for the testimony of truth, (which is understood to mean the same as preaching the gospel,) or they have done business; or paid for services, &c. without being impeached for breach of rule, or its being said he is paid for preaching—this, however, proves all I said in the pamphlet to be true. But you said in the meeting, that I had charged your speakers with taking money for preaching; I denied it, and read the charge: "They take money, and say they do not."—But you were confident that though it did not

say "*for preaching*," yet it implied the same thing, and I readily allowed it: but what did you gain by this concession? Why you gained this—you prove by implicit evidence that I said your preachers took money for preaching; and I, by the same kind of evidence, prove that they do take money for preaching.

O, my dear sirs, you have but the one of two things to do, to settle all this difficulty, and stop the force of my complaint in this matter: and the first is, to erase the two *articles* alluded to, and cease to pay your preachers for services or sufferings: or, secondly, to quit complaining of other denominations for doing openly and honesty what you do slyly; and this is no very hard task for you to do, provided you wish to be consistent in profession with your practice, or on equal terms of intimacy and fellowship with Christians of other denominations. But as I have understood that one of the great reasons you (as a people) would not join in the worship of God, with ministers of other denominations, was, because they took money for preaching; or, as you call them, *hirelings*; therefore, I

suppose herein will arise the difficulty in complying with what is proposed. But I would ask, By what authority you judge a minister a hireling for receiving a bare sufficiency of money for his decent support, when the money is raised by a voluntary contribution or subscription? Or, if a minister receives ever so much money, if it is evident that he makes a proper use of it, and discharges his duty as a a minister of the gospel of Christ to his flock? I think you would not say that he was a dishonourable or dishonest hireling. Your censure in this respect has been hard and cruel, because you have condemned the righteous with the wicked: for though some ministers in the different denominations have been guilty of preaching for the alone sake of filthy lucre; it is as evident also, that there have been and still are others in different denominations that preach the gospel according to the light they have, from a pure conviction of the spirit of God, that it is their duty: and for you or any other sect of people to condemn all without respect of persons, is unrighteous judgment. By their fruits we are to know them,

and judge of them; and when we see the majority among the different denominations agreeing in the scripture ordinances, (though they differ with respect to mode of administration) and willing to unite in the worship of God, such as joining in prayer, and hearing each other preach and exhort, and many among them can set or kneel together before God, and commemorate the death and passion of the adorable Jesus in the sacred supper, who are you, that ye will not join in prayer with any of them, and take upon you to judge such people unworthy of Christian fellowship, calling them *blind, carnal, not yet in the true light.* But you will say, We profess to believe that there is some good people in all denominations. Do you profess this? then I beseech you to evidence sincerity in your profession, by joining in prayer with such when they desire to join in prayer or the worship of God together with you. I was grieved at the close of our meeting, when the Rev. Jonathan Lyon desired to have all join him in prayer to God, and you all refused by sitting with your hats on, though some of your mem-

bers had acknowledged before the congregation that he manifested a good spirit in what he said by way of inquiry, and that he was much pleased with it. Now to profess to have charity, or to believe a man is led by a good spirit, and then refuse to join in prayer with him, is such a departure from consistency as you ought to be ashamed of—but I pass on to notice your plea for the observance of the sabbath.

You said before the congregation that many of your people observed the sabbath, to keep it in a strict manner; and one of your sisters said, that the last yearly meeting recommended a more close observance of the sabbath than ever. But I ask, why do you plead for your observance of the sabbath, when you have denied the moral obligation of the fourth commandment? Is it not that you want the people to believe you hold to it just to save you from censure and disgrace? for you know that you do not hold to the moral obligation to observe the sabbath, nor don't mean to hold to it. Now if you want the people to believe that the Quakers do regard the first day of the

week as a sabbath unto the Lord, when you do not in reality, is not this using duplicity?

It was surprising to me, that after you had laboured so zealously to recommend your great regard and observance of the sabbath, that you should labour in the same congregation as you did, to prove that the moral obligation of it was disannulled; for if there is no moral obligation to keep it, there is no moral virtue in observing the sabbath, nor moral evil in violating it: and if you were strict to speak plain language you would say so, and not labour to hide your real sentiment rather than acknowledge your error. However, you appeared to be ignorant of plain language, as also of the scripture; you quoted Rom. xiv. 5, 6, and Col. ii. 16, "One man esteemeth one day above another, another esteemeth every day alike." But the apostle don't say that he esteemed every day alike, or that we should not esteem one day above another; however, to the Colossians he says, "Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days:"—and if the

Quakers regarded the sabbath and ordinances of the Lord, there would be no occasion to judge them as transgressors. But I told you that day, that this did not allude to the sabbath enjoined by the fourth commandment, or ordinances of Christ, but to feast days, enjoined by the ceremonial law, and were now done away; and my reasons are, because the Jewish festival or feast days were called by the Greeks sabbath days; though it is probable that many of the Jewish rabbies judged the apostles for observing the first day of the week, or for not believing the seventh day was now to be observed as the Christian sabbath. For if we notice what I have quoted from St. Barnabas' epistle, the apostles did consider the first day of the week as the right day to be observed as a sabbath unto the Lord. Also Mr. *Brown*, in his Dictionary of the Bible, on the word sabbath, says, "It must not be forgotten that till the Romans destroyed Jerusalem, the Jewish Christians shewed a respect to the ancient sabbath, and the apostles very often took the opportunity of preaching to the Jews, as they thereon assembled in

their synagogues, Acts xiii. 42, and xvi. 13, and xviii. 4. The first day was all along observed by Christians as their sabbath, for almost 1600 years before any pretenders to that name, that I know of, opposed it."

It appears that Mr. *Brown* must have alluded to the Quakers as well as *seventh day Baptists*, for I think they were the first that pretended to the name of Christian, and opposed the observance of the first day of the week as a sabbath unto the Lord.

It seems that you were sensible that what you had said and quoted did not prove what you wanted to: and one of your sisters arose and answered, "If our Lord had not intended to disannul the Sabbath, why did he transgress it?" I asked, Did he transgress it? She replied, "Did he not transgress it?" I said No. She said, "He was accused of it." One of your men said, "Did not his disciples transgress it, when they plucked the ears of corn?" The woman said, "Yes." I then addressed the congregation in these words: It is true, the old Pharisees did accuse our Lord and his disciples of sabbath breaking, but I never heard of any that accus-

ed our Lord, or the apostles, of violating the Sabbath, but the old Pharisees and the Quakers. And is it not a pity that the Quakers have no better authority to substantiate their principles than the testimony of them old Pharisees—And that testimony a false one too? for when our Lord, a little after, was brought to trial, and they sought for evidence to put him to death, and found none, they would have mentioned this if they had known him to be really guilty; for sabbath-breaking was a crime to be punished with death by the law.

I have said that you appeared to be ignorant of plain language. This is evident; for when one of you charged me before the congregation of "*Judging you very hard for using the plain language*," I denied it, and appealed to the congregation, that I had not judged you there, nor in the pamphlet; but on the contrary, I professed plain language, and had stiled myself a Plain Man, and Lover of Honesty; which loving of honesty I consider to be the essence of plain language. But as for *thee and thou*, though as I said, it was proper according to *Latin Grammar*, yet the

English Grammar did allow *you* to be in the singular; but that we had no command in scripture to confine ourselves to the one mode of *thee and thou*, in addressing a single person, any more than we were commanded to be good grammarians, or to speak good *French*, *Dutch*, or *English*. I farther observed, that your ancestors considered *thee and thou* as only the sample of plain language, while the thing intended was, to speak the truth, the whole truth, in plainness and openness of heart. But why will the Quakers take up with the bare sample of the thing? When I do not believe that there is to be found one Quaker that is so great a dunce as to buy three or four bales of cloth, and pay ten or twelve hundred dollars for them, and take up with the bare samples of the cloth, and leave the vender in possession of what he has paid so dear for. Neither would he open a trade with one that only kept samples to sell.

One thing more I would mention before I dismiss the relation of what passed between us in that meeting. You recollect that after I introduced the meeting by prayer, and read-

ing the letters of correspondence, I read a clause from your discipline, page 123, thus:— "It is recommended that all contention and personal reflections be kept out of our meetings, and that friends be *careful to keep out of heats and doubtful disputations*, in the ordering the affairs of truth; but that the same be conducted in the peaceable spirit and wisdom of Jesus; with decency, forbearance, and love to each other." I observed that this was a good rule, and I hoped that the Quakers would observe it on this occasion, as well as the rest of us. But when Mr. Franklin and others of you had interrupted me for some time, notwithstanding I read and explained your letter, you still persisted in opposing my right to vindicate myself, as I proposed in my second letter to you. I then charged you with a violation of your rule of discipline, but one of your sisters said, "We are not now under that rule, that alludes to our meeting for worship;" I said, I would wish to be under a good rule at all times.

I was sorry to find you so regardless of your good rules, and at the same time so zeal-

ous to vindicate your bad rules; it must be owing to some strange infatuation, or some evil spirit I fear has got an advantage over you, or else why do you have so little regard for the word of God, and so great regard for the word of *Fox* and *Barcley?* Why do you vilify the ordinances of Christ, by calling them carnal, dead, &c.? And why do you not find or understand a moral obligation to observe the sabbath of the Lord? I fear it is because some evil spirit haunts you, as one in ancient times did king Saul, when he had left God's commandments to set up his own authority. But that which relieved him at times, viz. music, will not relieve you, because you are averse to it: was it not so, I would administer to you in that way. But as I have understood what you were most fond of, viz. plainness of speech, I have administered to you (as I was able) in plainness. I pray the Lord to give me better success with you than *David* had with *Saul;* for as *David* was conscious that he was called of the Lord, and of *Saul* to administer to him in music, so I am confident that I am called of the Lord

and of you, since I received your letter, to administer to you in plainness: and if I knew you would thrust at me with your javelin of Deistical trash, to wound or destroy my character, as *Saul* thrust at *David* to destroy his life, I would not dare to withhold, such is my love and concern for you. I must lift up my voice like a trumpet, and shew the birthright Quakers their transgression, and the most enlightened part of your members their sins. I beseech you to let my counsel be acceptable to you; for I speak not in my own name, but in the name of him who said, "Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy;" yea, in the name of him who said, "Eat, this is my body;" and also said, "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth; go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them," &c. This is the name I fear and love; and for his sake I entreat you to consider what I say: it is truly awful to have a form of godliness and not the power; but think, my dear sirs, O think how much more awful for you, that insead of a form of godliness you have a man-made form, an institution

of an heated imagination. And if we consider what the Lord said to his chosen people, "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me, saith the Lord: I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he-goats: bring no more vain oblations, incense is an abomination unto me; the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies I cannot away with, it is iniquity." Because of the unhallowed heart and hands of priests and people, which made their offering an abomination to the Lord, though the ordinance was instituted by him—but how much more abominable must those man-made forms of religion be, when attended to without a knowledge of the spirit or power, as is too much the case with thousands of your birthright members. And if the Lord saith to those who attended his own ordinances in an improper manner, "Who hath required this at your hands to tread my courts?" how much more stern and severe will he say to Quakers, Who hath required this at your hand to wear your hats or uncover your heads as a sign of adoration? Who hath required you to violate my

sabbaths, and deny or blaspheme my ordinances by calling them carnal?

Hear, dear sirs, for the terrible voice of the Lord by his prophet Malachi, will serve to warn and reform you, if you will hear: "Behold what a weariness is it! and ye have snuffed at it, saith the Lord of hosts! And ye brought that which was torn, and the lame, and the sick; thus ye brought an offering: should I accept this at your hands, saith the Lord. But cursed be the deceiver which hath in his flock a male, and voweth and sacrificeth unto the Lord a corrupt thing; for I am a great king, saith the Lord of hosts." O consider how the Quakers have snuffed with scorn at the holy ordinances of the adorable Jesus, and sacrificed much to support a corrupt notion of wearing the hat. But how will the word of God like seven thunders sound to their everlasting confusion, if they repent not. "Your words have been stout against me, saith the Lord; yet ye say, What have we spoken so much against thee? Ye have said it is vain to serve God; and what profit is it that we have kept his ordi-

nances, and that we have walked mournfully before the Lord of hosts. Even from the days of your fathers" (Fox and Barclay) "ye have gone away from my ordinances, and have not kept them. Will a man rob God? Yet ye have robbed me. But ye say Wherein have we robbed thee? In tithes and offerings. Ye are cursed with a curse: for ye have robbed me, even this whole nation."—Even so the Quakers have robbed God, by refusing to pay tribute to the governments they have lived under. Their refusal is contrary to the command which saith, "Be subject not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake." And speaking of the civil governments the apostle saith, "The powers that be are ordained of God, and he that resists the power resisteth the ordinances of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation." And by the prophet he saith: "If ye will not hear, and if ye will not lay it to heart to give glory to my name, saith the Lord of hosts, I will even send a curse upon you, and I will curse your blessings; yea, I have cursed them already, because ye do not lay it to

heart—but ye are gone out of the way, ye have caused many to stumble at the law."—This the Quakers have done by denying the moral obligation of the fourth commandment.

You cannot deny the force and application of that reproof in the text that saith, "Your words have been stout against me—ye have said it is vain to serve God and keep his ordinances." How many of you have spoken against serving God in the use of his ordinances, as a vain thing; and instead of encouraging vocal prayer to God in the family or in public, you have as a people declaimed against it: this is not giving glory to God, by refusing to obey his command, "To pray with all prayer and supplication in the spirit, watching thereunto: and praying every where, lifting up holy hands without wrath or doubting."

It is well known that the common practice with Quakers in advising those, who by reason of guilt for sin,

> Groan the sinner's only plea,
> God be merciful to me.

say to them, Be still, wait for the Lord in si-

lence. This exhortation would do if they were raging against the Lord; for, in order to obtain mercy they must cease to do evil and learn to do well. But you so preach your notion of silence, that you would have us believe that the good spirit is dumb in his opearations, as the bad spirit was in a certain case; whereas the truth is, the devil would keep us dumb, so that we should never speak for God, if he could; and I fear he has got an advantage over you by transforming himself into an angel of light, that you are deceived by him into a mistaken notion of silence.

All true gospel ministers are inspired with counsel for mourning penitents, that is as different from this vain notion of yours as light is different from darkness.

They will exhort them to fly to the city of refuge, to the Lord Jesus Christ; tarry not in all the plain; be not a silent or idle spectator, "For the kingdom of God is preached, and every one presseth into it," Luke xvi. 16: yea, "The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force" As Jacob of whom it is said, Hosea

xii. 3. "By his strength he had power with God; yea, he had power over the angel, and prevailed: he wept and made supplication unto him; and he said, I will not let thee go until thou bless me, Gen. xxxii. 26. Or as David, who said: "Surely I will not come into the tabernacle of my house, nor go up into my bed; I will not give sleep to mine eyes, or slumber to my eyelids, until I find out a place for the Lord, an habitation for the mighty God of Jacob," Psalm cxxxii. 3. Those worthies wrestled in mighty faith and prayer; they were not still or silent, nodding with sleep, but awake to a sense of their duty and their wants, and God was well pleased with their zeal. And if a gospel minister directs the penitent sinner to seek after God, in the ordinances of his house with the people of God, it would not be contrary to divine inspiration, for God is with his people: therefore when they are assembled for his worship, they attend in the order of the gifts of the spirit; to preach, exhort, sing hymns and pray, in regular order; so that hereby the unbelieving who attend with them "is con-

vinced, and falling down on his face he will worship God, and report that God is in you of a truth," 1 Cor. xiv. 25. But if a people assemble together, and have no preaching, exhortation, psalm or prayer, in regular order, it is in my opinion because a dumb devil possesses them, even such an one as will not go out without sharp rebuke with fasting and prayer. O! do not cry peace, peace, in such unscriptural silence; but consider and lay it to heart; I beseech you to consider. If you open your eyes to the light, and your ears to hear the word of the Lord, you will understand that "no man lighteth a candle, and putteth it under a bushel." "Ye that make mention of the Lord keep not silence," saith the Lord. Therefore, if you are called to preach the word, "be instant in season, out of season:" that is, at all times, whether day or night, whenever an opportunity offers to speak for God, the servant should be ready to speak for his master. The prophet Isaiah, Chap. lvi. 10, complains of some for their silence, "His watchmen" (says he) "are blind, they are all ignorant; they are all dumb dogs,

they cannot bark ; sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber."

I know that silent meetings are highly approved of by the Quakers ; many have spoke to me of the happiness and satisfaction they have had in silent meetings ; but I never found one that profest to enjoy an abiding witness of the pardon of his sins, or that he was born of God. I have asked many of them if they knew they were born of God ; and they would either evade an answer, or say no.* As to the abiding witness of the spirit that they are born of God, they are ignorant ; the language is strange to them. Yet these same ignorant birthright professors of Quakerism pretend to be led by the spirit of God, and judge of others, whether they are led by the spirit or not. Strange infatuation ! the blind may as well judge of colours, and the deaf of sounds, as these men can judge of the spirit, that are not born of the spirit : " The natural

---

* Not regarding the advice of St. Peter iii. 15. " Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you, a reason of the hope that is in you."

man knoweth not the things of the spirit," saith St. *Paul.* Your bold and frequent judging the dear children of God, merely because they worship God in the use of his ordinances, calling them *blind, carnal, not yet in the true light,* as you may see in *Barcley* and *Fox's* writings, and also hear from your speakers frequently, are sins of a deep die; for Jesus says, Matt. xxv. 40, "Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." But "though your sins were as crimson," the Lord can pardon and cleanse you, if you will repent; O be intreated to repent and reform. I cannot speak unto you as unto children or babes, but as unto carnal; therefore I beseech you to repent: "Break off your sins by righteousness," and your violations of the sabbath, and contempt of Christian duties, by attending to the ordinances of Christ; for "Ye have departed from his ordinances, ye have committed two evils; ye have left the Lord the fountain of living waters, and have hewed out to yourselves cisterns, broken cisterns that can hold

no water." Jer. vii. "Thus saith the Lord God of hosts, the God of Israel, Amend your ways and your doings, and I will cause you to dwell in this place;" but "Trust ye not in lying words, saying, The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord are these." Will ye walk after "other gods, and come and stand before me, and say: We are delivered to do all these abominations:" that is like saying, we are led by the spirit to transgress the ordinances and sabbath of the Lord.

"But this thing commanded I them, saying: Obey my voice and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people. But thou shalt say unto them, this is a nation that obeyeth not the Lord their God, nor receiveth correction; truth is perished and is cut off from their mouth: the wise men are ashamed, they are dismayed and taken; lo, they have rejected the WORD of the Lord. And the Lord saith, Because they have forsaken my law which I set before them, and have not obeyed my voice, neither walked therein, but have walked after the imagination of their

own heart, and went backward and not forward: therefore thus saith the Lord of host: Behold I will feed them, even this people with wormwood, and give them water of gall to drink." So they shall say, "Why do we sit still? assemble yourselves, and let us enter into the defenced city, and let us be silent there; for the Lord our God hath put us to silence, and given us water of gall to drink, because we have sinned against the Lord."

Although I have given you one text for silence, it is by no means such silence as you would plead for as a religious ordinance or tradition. However, you cannot deny but silence, on such occasions and causes as is described in the text is scriptural; and you cannot blame me, if I exhort you to this kind of silence, seeing I only want you to be rationally scriptural in what you do.

But "whether you will hear or whether you will forbear," I have spoken. My wish is that you would repent and reform; and as no person can repent of errors until he knows himself guilty of them, therefore I have made a plain statement of your errors, that if you

will read and lay it to heart, you must know that a reformation is highly necessary for your peace and safety. You cannot deny the truth of the charges, with the least shadow of evidence or reason; you know they are true; for you acknowledged before the congregation three times on the day of the meeting, that you could not prove them false.

Why then will you not reform? Is it because you are like those spoken of in the text, "This is a nation that obeyeth not the Lord their God, nor receiveth correction; truth is perished, and is cut off from their mouth?" Or do you suppose that suffering for your sin will atone for it? I heard of an ignorant Indian that was convicted of the crime of sabbath breaking, and the magistrate fined him according to law, which when he had payed he asked his honor for a certificate, that when he came to the bar of God to give up his account, he might prove he had payed for that sin. But can it be that Quakers who pretend to so much light, still remain as ignorant as an Indian? No, they must know that though they suffer for their faults, it does not atone

for them. Well then, may I not hope that though your people have madly ran on in violation of the laws of God and the ordinances of Jesus Christ, you will now reform.

It was for this end I wrote the errors of the Quakers; but though I fear it will terminate with me as it did with the prophet, when the Lord said to him, "Therefore thou shalt speak all these words unto them, but they will not hearken to thee; thou shalt also call unto them, but they will not answer thee, nor receive correction"—Yet with sentiments of respect and love for you, hoping better things than my fears suggest, I subscribe myself your friend, in sincerity and truth, having given you warning; still I am determined to pray and hope for your reformation, while I remain,

BILLY HIBBARD.

POSTSCRIPT.

I AM not ashamed nor sorry that I wrote the Errors of the Quakers, for two reasons.

1st. Because they ought to be told of their faults, that they might repent.

2d. Because I love the Quakers, and wish them well.

I am not sorry that I wrote as I did, because it is the truth: though I am sorry there was an occasion for it.

Some say that the Quakers are a peaceable sect of people, that they do not speak against any other denominations. I wish this was true, it would please me better than to write.

But when Quakers separate the spirit from the Word of God, or scripture of truth; they "put asunder what God hath joined together." It is in effect denying the unity of the Trinity, and trusting in fancy instead of plain declaration of truth. And when they call the ordinances of Jesus Christ carnal, and the

ministers that worship God in the use of them blind and carnal, I say they judge unrighteously: and when Quakers ask people of other persuasions for liberty to hold meetings in their houses or meeting-house, and refuse the like privilege to them, this argues that they think much of themselves; and I suppose they would be ashamed of it, if they knew that it was doing as they would not be done by.

If the reader will turn to the good old book, and read Ezekiel, Chap. iii. 17, 18, 19, 20, he will see my commission for what I have done: "Son of man I have made thee a watchman unto the house of Israel, therefore hear the word at my mouth, and give them warning from me. When I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die, and thou givest him not warning, nor speakest to warn the wicked from his wicked way, to save his life; the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity, but his blood will I require at thine hand," &c. I wish the reader to turn and read all the text.

Now if I dont warn the wicked violaters of the Sabbath, and contemners of the ordinances

of Christ, I shall be guilty of their blood; or at least if I neglect to do the best I can to warn them; but if I call and they stop their ears, or if I write and they refuse to read, then I think I am clear, and their blood will be upon their own heads; and as the Quakers would not attend the meetings where I preached, nor the meetings of my brethren, who are as I am in the faith of the gospel, nor yet those of any other persuasion that believe with us in essential points of doctrine, nor yet will they suffer me or them to preach in any of their houses; thereby shutting themselves out from all reproof or instructions, and refusing to lay open to conviction, there was no way to come at them for their good, but to write; therefore I wrote, and I did not draw my bow at a venture, for I well knew what I was about. I saw them snugly seated in their chariot of significations, defying all denominations by refusing to join in the worship of God with any, so I shot my opinion like pointed arrows, in a few pages, and it entered "between the joints of the harness," 1 Kings xxii. 34.—and I can say in this matter as

Luther said on a saimilar occasion, as related by Mr. *Flavel* in his book of sermons, page 466, "When one told *Luther* what hideous outcries his enemies made against him, and how they reviled him, &c. *I know by their roaring* (said he) *that I have hit them right.*"

I would advertise my reader, that I have also been musing with myself, what could be the cause of all the rage and clamour of the Quakers against me and my pamphlet; one while I thought it proceeded from want of discretion, that they were not able to distinguish between a reproof of their principle and a calumny or slander of the character of the person or people; therefore they thought that every blow against their errors must needs be a mortal wound to their reputation. And their giving countenance to A—— D——. Esq. the deist, in circulating and reading his book so freely, &c. I have thought was an effect of their policy, that when followed close, and hard put to it for argument to answer, they have endeavoured an escape that way.

This reminds me of what Mr. *Flavel* tells of *Camero*, speaking of this kind of subtilty in

his opponents, saith: "Some cunning animals as foxes, &c." when pursued at the heels, drives away both dogs and huntsmen with their intolerable stench." In like manner the Quaker's attempt to drive me back from my purpose, by the intolerable stench of deism in Mr. D.'s book of Farragoes. But severe and close as my discourse has been against the Errors of the Quakers, I am sure it is more full of civility and respect to them as a people, than to deserve such treatment; for if in exposing their errors their reputation be exposed also, they must blame their errors for the occasion of it, and not me.

The great cry of deists and infidels of all descriptions has ever been against the principle that teaches the moral obligations we are under to God; and the certainty of a day of just judgment, and of rewards and punishments. The moral law is an eye-sore to them—restraints are painful. Present ease is naturally desired by all. The cross of Christ is mortifying to corrupt nature, and self-will. Liberty and licentiousness are thought by

infidels to be about synonimous. Therefore, those principles that discard the moral law pleases them best. To ward off the force of reproof, they plead the fault of the reprover, if he has one; and if not, *report say they, and we will report it*—thus raise one against him; true or false they make it serve to ease their own guilty conscience. True confession when convicted is very rare, but to dispute the point a while is very common. In these days self-conceit is the god of many, yea, of all such as disregard the scripture as a rule for faith and practice. Fancy is the next to receive divine honours—whimsical or mystical subjects are resorted to for justification. Ignorance of revealed religion is plead in excuse for neglect of all religion. Stale morality is as much as such people want. By stale morality I mean abstaining from gross sins, while they live quietly in the neglect of what the law requires, i. e. just towards man, but not just towards God.

Prayer is a duty and a labour very humiliating, when performed in a proper spirit and manner: but it has racked the brains of

the haughty and self-conceited part of community, to find out some mode of performing this duty without mortifying their pride, or discovering their want of a right spirit or gift; therefore some read prayers, and some learn a form by heart, and say it off quite fluently, while other do all their praying without saying a word, i. e. what they call praying in the spirit. But we should never know they prayed at all, if they did not tell us of it; and some of them boast mightily now well they pray, and condemn forms of prayer, or reading prayers; and even vocal prayer of any kind they highly disapprove. But some of all persuasions have attended to vocal prayer to God, and not been tied to form, nor thought the worse of those that used a form, provided they had the spirit and power with it. Extempore prayer is proper, so is formal prayer proper, but either without the spirit of faith availeth not.

Notwithstanding all I have said about the Quakers, and statements I have made of their errors in principle, and forms of worship; also of their common practice of evading the force of the charges in the pamphlet, or otherwise, I would remind the reader that I believe

some Quakers are good men, and that I feel a sincere pity and concern for their welfare; because to me they appear like some useful property that lays buried in the ruins of an old building; or like old people that have lost the reins of government, groan and weep to see their rising progeny despise and reject their well known counsels. Could I help them, my grand end in writing would be answered; and in order to help them I have laid hold of some of the materials of their old ruined building, that if possible they might be removed so far as to open a way for the sincere and distressed among them to escape from delusion.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

Page 32, line 12 from bottom, for *in* read *to.*
do. 40, do. 3 from botton, for *hut* read *but.*
do. 63, do. 4 from top, leave out *own.*
do. 71, do. 4 from bottom, for *teat* read *that.*
do. 73. do. 9 from top, for *truth* read *proof.*
do. 75, do. 7 from bottom, for *or* read *on.*
do. 95, do. 4 from bottom, for *thin* read *think.*
do. 103, do. 3 from top, for *he* read *you.* [*thou*
do. 107, do. 6 from top, after the word *testimony* read

J. C. Totten, printer, 155 Chatham-street, New-York.